Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
061454 MAY 3 - 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

SEMPRA GENERATION ET AL.,
PETITIONERS,

v.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ET AL.,
RESPONDENTS.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JEFFREY D. WATKISS
BRACEWELL & GIULIANI LLP
200 K STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
(202) 828-5851
Attorney for Petitioner Coral Power, L.L.C.

JAMES N. WESTWOOD
STOEL RIVES LLP
900 SW FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2600
PORTLAND, OR 97204
(503) 294-9187
Attorney for Petitioner PPM Energy, Inc.

RICHARD P. BRESS
Counsel of Record
MICHAEL J. GERGEN
STEPHANIE S. LIM
BARRY J. BLONIEN
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 11TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20004
(202) 637-2200
Attorneys for Petitioner Sempra Generation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Public Utilities Commission of California v. FERC,
474 F.3d 587 (9th Cir. 2006) 1a

Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,
99 FERC ¶ 61,087 (Apr. 25, 2002) 16a

Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,
100 FERC ¶ 61,098 (July 23, 2002) 49a

Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,
102 FERC ¶ 63,013 (Jan. 16, 2003) 66a

Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,
103 FERC ¶ 61,354 (June 26, 2003) 91a

Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,
105 FERC ¶ 61,182 (Nov. 10, 2003) 215a

Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County v. FERC,
471 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2006) 268a

Statutory Provisions
16 U.S.C. § 824 ..... 330a
16 U.S.C. § 824a 334a

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

Page

16 U.S.C. § 824d.....339a
16 U.S.C. § 824e.....344a
16 U.S.C. § 825*l*.....349a

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
NINTH CIRCUIT

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF the STATE OF CALIFORNIA; California Electric Oversight Board, Petitioners,

Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Nevada Power Company; Southern California Edison Co. ("Edison"); Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Public Service Department of the City of Burbank, Public Service Department of the City of Glendale, and Water and Power Department of the City of Pasadena (Collectively "LADWP, et al."); Sempra Energy; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, L.P.; Coral Power; PPM Energy; Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington; Dynegy Power Marketing Inc., Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION, Respondent.

California Electric Oversight Board; California Public Utilities Commission, Petitioners,

Nevada Power Company; Southern California Edison Co. ("Edison"); Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Public Service Department of the City of Burbank, Public Service Department of the City of Glendale, and Water and Power Department of the City of Pasadena (Collectively "LADWP, et al."); Sempra Energy; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, L.P.; PPM Energy; Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington; Dynegy Power Marketing Inc., Intervenors,

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Respondent.

Nos. 03-74207, 03-74246.

Argued and Submitted Dec. 8, 2004.

Filed Dec. 19, 2006.

Before BROWNING, PREGERSON, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

BERZON, Circuit Judge.

As in *Public Utility District No. 1 v. FERC* ("*PUD* "), Nos. 03-72511, et al. (9th Cir. Dec. __, 2006), a related case also decided today, the petitioners—here, the California Public Utilities Commission ("PUC") and the California Electric Oversight Board ("CEOB") (collectively, "Public Utilities Commission")—challenge the statutory validity of electric power rates in certain wholesale power contracts. Again as in *PUD*, that challenge hinges on whether the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") was correct to apply the *Mobile-Sierra*[1] "public interest" doctrine or whether in doing so it failed to meet its statutory obligation to provide "just and reasonable" review. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 824e(a).

In *PUD*, we explained that *Mobile-Sierra* represents a presumption "that private parties to a wholesale electric power contract have negotiated a 'just and reasonable' contract over a designated period of time, lawful under the FPA throughout that period." *PUD*, Slip Op. at 19554. That presumption, however, "can be rebutted by

[1] This shorthand takes its name from two Supreme Court cases decided on the same day: *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.* (*Mobile*), 350 U.S. 332, 76 S.Ct. 373, 100 L.Ed. 373 (1956), and *Federal Power Commission v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.* (*Sierra*), 350 U.S. 348, 76 S.Ct. 368, 100 L.Ed. 388 (1956).

establishing that the contract adversely affects the public interest." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19554. We concluded that, to establish the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption, "three prerequisites are necessary: (1) the contract by its own terms must not preclude the limited *Mobile-Sierra* review; (2) the regulatory scheme in which the contracts are formed must provide FERC with an opportunity for effective, timely review of the contracted rates; and (3) where, as here, FERC is relying on a market-based rate-setting system to produce just and reasonable rates, this review must permit consideration of all factors relevant to the propriety of the contract's formation." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19555-56. In *PUD* we found two of these prerequisites lacking and remanded to FERC for it to consider the propriety of applying the *Mobile-Sierra* mode of review to the contracts at issue. We held, in the alternative, that even if *Mobile-Sierra* properly applied, FERC's "finding that the challenged contracts do not affect the public interest was based on a substantively erroneous mode of analysis." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19549.

Applying *PUD* to the challenged contracts in this case, we grant the petition to review and remand to the agency to apply the modes of review outlined in *PUD*.

I.

Much of the relevant background to this case is described in *PUD*. *See id.*, Slip Op. at 19567-83. We therefore will summarize only those facts relevant to the present case.

A. California Energy Crisis

California responded to the energy crisis outlined in *PUD* in several ways, although not until after "rolling blackout" became a household phrase and several of California's largest utilities bordered on insolvency. Governor Gray Davis declared a state of emergency on January 17, 2001, and ordered the California Department of Water Resources ("CDWR") to purchase forward power "as expeditiously as possible." On February 1, 2001, the

California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 1 of the 2001-2002 First Extraordinary Session ("AB1X"), which authorized CDWR to purchase power through the end of December 31, 2002.

Between February 6 and August 23, 2001, CDWR executed 57 forward contracts with 28 suppliers. Some of these contracts explicitly called for applying the relatively stringent *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" test, rather than the relatively relaxed "just and reasonable" test to judge the rates included in the contracts. Other contracts were silent regarding the test to apply. The 57 contracts include 32 agreements with the intervenor-respondents in this case:[2]

- Coral Power, for prices from $169 to $249/MWh, for delivery in 2001 and 2002;
- Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc., for $119.50/MWh, for delivery from January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2004;
- Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, for $148.65/MWh, for delivery between June 1, 2001 and December 31, 2002;
- PacifiCorp ("PPM"), for $70/MWh, for delivery between July 29, 2001 and June 30, 2002; and
- Sempra Energy Resources, for $189/MWh, for delivery between June 1, 2001 and September 30, 2001.

Under AB1X, the people of California must pay the cost of these contracts through their electricity rates. *See* CAL. WATER CODE § 80104 (West) ("Upon the delivery of power to them, the retail end use customers shall be deemed to have purchased that power from the department. Payment for any sale shall be a direct obligation of the retail end use customer to the department."). Raymond Hart, who testified for the Public Utilities Commission, described this statutory provision as ensuring that costs of CDWR contracts would "be passed on to the retail end-users of the

---

[2] These energy companies are all intervenors on behalf of FERC in this case.

IOUs [investor-owned utilities] through their retail electricity rates." In other words, CDWR passed the costs of the power it purchased to local utilities—such as Pacific Gas and Electric—which, in turn, passed it on to California consumers. FERC questions whether the challenged contracts call for rates above long-run competitive prices, *Pub. Utils. Comm'n v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 103 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,354, at ¶ 62,415 (2003), but does not contest that the cost of those contracts is passed on to California consumers.

On June 19, 2001, FERC issued a price mitigation order for spot markets regarding several western states, which went into effect the following day. Subsequently, prices generally returned to pre-crisis levels in both spot and forward markets, completing a downward cycle that had begun about a month prior to the June 19 Order.

B. Procedural Background

On February 25, 2002, PUC filed complaints under section 206(a) of the Federal Power Act,[3] 16 U.S.C. § 824e(a), seeking modification of all power contracts signed by CDWR in 2001.[4] The only contracts at issue on this appeal are those listed above, which PUC alleges

---

[3] Whenever the Commission, after a hearing had upon its own motion or upon complaint, shall find that any rate, charge, or classification, demanded observed, charged, or collected by any public utility for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or that any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affect such rate, charge, or classification is *unjust, unreasonable,* unduly discriminatory or preferential, the Commission shall determine the *just and reasonable* rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and shall fix the same by order.

16 U.S.C. § 824e(a) (emphases added).

[4] Much of the parties' disagreement hinges on whether the identity of the parties—state agencies other than those that entered into the challenged agreements—affects the application of *Mobile-Sierra* to those agreements. As we decide, applying *PUD*, that FERC erred for other reasons by applying *Mobile-Sierra*, we need not reach the question of the impact of the parties' identity.

overcharge CDWR and California consumers by a total of $1.4 billion. In the process of adjudicating and ultimately denying these complaints, FERC issued a series of orders:

On April 25, 2002, FERC ordered a hearing to determine "whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue [was] warranted." *Pub. Utils. Comm'n v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 99 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,087, at ¶ 61,384 (2002) (footnote omitted). FERC announced that it would review all contracts explicitly calling for "public interest" review under *Mobile-Sierra*,[5] while setting for hearing the question of whether it would also apply that standard to contracts that were silent on the issue.[6] *Id.* ¶ 61,383. FERC dismissed the complaints with regard to all contracts executed on or after June 20, 2001, the date its final price mitigation order went into effect, including the CDWR contract with PPM, which had been negotiated before but signed after that date. Finally, the April 25 order held that 19625 both the PUC and CEOB " 'stepped into the shoes' of CDWR," which is not a party in this case, because they are all state agencies. *Id.* ¶ 61,382. Accordingly, the petitioners would both be treated as if they were the same entity as CDWR. *Id.*

Before the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"), PUC sought discovery regarding the sellers' ability to exercise market power in the spot markets. The ALJ denied this request, reasoning that "the hearing order in this case takes as a given the proposition that the California spot markets were dysfunctional." Additionally, the ALJ excluded some evidence, in the form of testimony by PUC's expert witnesses, that related to the sellers' market power in the forward markets.

---

[5] These included the Coral and Mirant contracts.

[6] These included the Dynergy, Sempra, and PPM contracts.

At the conclusion of the ALJ's hearing, FERC created a two-track process. For contracts that had explicit provisions calling for the "public interest" test, FERC instructed the ALJ not to rule on those cases and instead to certify the record directly to the Commission. For the other contracts, the ALJ was directed to decide only whether the parties intended the public interest test to apply. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 101 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,293, at ¶ 62,173 (2002).

On February 10, 2003, FERC, on remand from this court, *Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Cal. v. FERC*, Order of August 21, 2002, (9th Cir. Docket Nos. 01-71051, et al.), issued an order in a separate case relating to spot market manipulation, permitting discovery for over 100 days regarding such manipulation and requiring parties in that case to provide an index of discovered material "for each other pending or proposed proceeding" where the parties so request. *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Sellers of Energy & Ancillary Servs.*, 102 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,164, at ¶ 61,446 (2003). Through this "100 Days Proceeding," PUC discovered additional evidence regarding sellers' spot market manipulation.

On March 26, 2003, FERC staff issued its "Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets." STAFF OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION, FINAL REPORT ON PRICE MANIPULATION IN WESTERN MARKETS: FACT-FINDING INVESTIGATION OF POTENTIAL MANIPULATION OF ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS PRICES ["Staff Report"] (2003), *available at* http://www.ferc.gov/legal/maj-ord-reg/land-docs/PART-I-3-26-03.pdf [Staff Report]. The Staff Report concluded that the spot market dysfunction had "significant" adverse effects on the forward markets. *Id.* at V-12.

FERC issued an initial decision on June 26, 2003, rejecting all of PUC's claims. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 103 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,354 (2003). Most importantly, FERC concluded that the "public interest" test would apply to all contracts at issue, upholding the ALJ's opinion that parties

to all contracts intended to trigger that test. *Id.* ¶ 62,409. Accordingly, evidence regarding the spot markets' adverse effect on forward markets—the very issue FERC initially deemed to be the purpose of the hearings—was deemed not "relevant," as the "just and reasonable" test did not apply. *Id.* ¶ 62,415. "Under the 'public interest' standard, to justify contract modification it is not enough to show that forward prices became unjust and unreasonable due to the impact of spot market dysfunctions; it must be shown that the rates, terms and conditions are contrary to the public interest."[7] *Id.* Further, FERC concluded that PUC failed to satisfy any of the three prongs of the public interest test established by Supreme Court precedent (described below) or "any other factor" that might go to public interest. *Id.* FERC found "no credible record evidence that the contracts at issue are placing Complainants in financial distress." *Id.* FERC based this conclusion on a comparison of CDWR's goal of "a portfolio that yielded a weighted average price no higher than $70/MWh" with its actual portfolio, 19627 which averaged a price of $84/MWh for 2001-2005. *Id.* Commissioner Massey dissented, calling application of the "public interest" test inappropriate. Commissioner Massey also concluded that PUC proved a strong "nexus between the California spot market and the forward contract market," and that PUC met both the just and reasonable and public interest standards for contract reformation. *Id.* ¶¶ 62,448-49 (Massey, Comm'r, dissenting).

FERC denied rehearing on November 10, 2003. *Pub. Utils.Comm'n v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 105 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,182 (2003). One week later, PUC and CEOB filed petitions for review with this court.

---

[7] This language appears verbatim in FERC's *PUD* orders. *See Nev. Power Co. v. Enron Power Mktg., Inc.*, 103 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,353, at ¶ 61,397 (2003).

C. Standard of Review

We review FERC's legal decisions de novo. *Am. Rivers v. FERC*, 201 F.3d 1186, 1194 (9th Cir.1999). "Our review of a FERC decision is limited to whether the decision was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, unsupported by substantial evidence, or not in accordance with the law." *Cal. Dep't of Water Res. v. FERC*, 341 F.3d 906, 910 (9th Cir.2003); *see also* 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). The court reviews factual findings for substantial evidence, 16 U.S.C. § 825l (b), and will uphold them so long as the agency considered all relevant factors and did not make a clear error of judgment, *Cal. Dep't of Water Res.*, 341 F.3d at 906. When an agency makes an informed choice to rely on one expert opinion among competing expert opinions, the agency is entitled to deference. *Bear Lake Watch, Inc. v. FERC*, 324 F.3d 1071, 1076-77 (9th Cir.2003). FERC "is not obligated to justify deviations from an approach suggested by its own staff" unless "the conceptual underpinnings of the staff's approach [are] critical to a reasoned resolution of the problem"; in such cases FERC must address staff recommendations. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n v. FERC*, 817 F.2d 858, 862 (D.C.Cir.1987).

II.

Application of Mobile-Sierra

We hold in *PUD*, decided today, that FERC may apply the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" mode of review only if three conditions are present: "(1) the contract by its own terms must not preclude the limited *Mobile-Sierra* review; (2) the regulatory scheme in which the contracts are formed must provide FERC with an opportunity for effective, timely review of the contracted rates; and (3) where, as here, FERC is relying on a market-based rate-setting system to produce just and reasonable rates, this review must permit consideration of all factors relevant to the propriety of the contract's formation." *PUD*, Slip Op. at 19555-56. Here, it is undisputed that the contracts at issue either explicitly call for *Mobile-Sierra* review or do not

preclude it. *Cf. PUD*, Slip Op. at 19589-93. Thus, resolution of the present case turns on whether the second two *Mobile-Sierra* prerequisites were met, permitting FERC to rely on the doctrine's presumption of just and reasonable rates.

1. *Timely and Effective Review of Rates*

In *PUD*, we hold "that although market-based rate authority *can* qualify as sufficient prior review to justify limited *Mobile-Sierra* review, it can only do so when accompanied by effective oversight permitting timely reconsideration of market-based authorization if market conditions change." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19593. Here, as in *PUD*, "the fatal flaw in FERC's approach to 'oversight' is that it precludes timely consideration of sudden market changes and offers no protection to purchasers victimized by the abuses of sellers or dysfunctional market conditions that FERC itself only notices in hindsight." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19603.

Energy company intervenors and amici argue here, as FERC did in *PUD*, that petitioners or CDWR should have challenged the sellers' market-based rate authority before entering into the forward contracts, rather than agree to and subsequently challenge the contracts. This argument fails for the same reasons it failed in *PUD*. *See id.*, Slip Op. at 19601-02 ("Any such challenge, even if successful, could not have been a basis for reforming the challenged contracts ....").

Dynegy raises an argument unique to its contract, which it did file with FERC, effective March 6, 2001, and which FERC opened to the public for comments.[8] *Dynegy Power Mktg., Inc.*, 95 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,371 (2001). Dynegy asserts that PUC had an opportunity, during the public comment

---

[8] Dynegy's argument on this point refers only to the prior review prerequisite to application of *Mobile-Sierra*. Even if its argument succeeded on this point, it would not be sufficient to overcome the other portions of our opinion which provide independent reasons for granting PUC's petition for review.

period, to raise a substantive challenge to this contract but declined to do so.

Nothing about this circumstance, however, justifies a contrary result from that reached with regard to all the other contracts. FERC explicitly noted that accepting the filing of the Dynegy contract did "not constitute approval of any ... rate ...; and such action is without prejudice to any findings or orders which ... may hereafter be made by the Commission in any proceeding now pending or hereafter instituted by or against Dynegy." *Id.* ¶ 62,401. FERC, therefore, did not give prior approval to the Dynegy contract any more than it did for any of the other contracts challenged here. Further, any challenge to the contract at the time FERC sought public comments would have been hampered by limited information: At the time Dynegy filed its contract, the full scale of spot market manipulation and forward market dysfunction was not nearly as fully known as it is today.

For these reasons, we hold here that FERC "cannot use [its] choice [of regulatory regime] to excuse its duty to maintain effective oversight [of rates] and then invoke *Mobile-Sierra* as a ground for precluding ordinary rate review, including review of the propriety of market-based rate authority at the time the contracts became effective." *PUD*, Slip Op. at 19603.

2. *Meaningful Review of Contract Formation*

Even if the agency had not committed "[t]his fundamental procedural error[,] ... FERC's substantive adherence to *Mobile-Sierra* without regard to the market conditions in which the contracts at issue were formed" was error. *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19604. In particular, FERC refused to consider evidence of forward market dysfunction caused by the spot market, asserting that such evidence was not "relevant" unless the "just and reasonable" test applied. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,415. Because "*Mobile-Sierra* cannot apply without a determination that the challenged contract was initially formed free from the

influence of improper factors, such as market manipulation, the leverage of market power, or an otherwise dysfunctional market," *PUD*, Slip Op. at 19604, FERC's reliance on the "public interest" mode of review here was improper.

As in *PUD*, FERC failed to respond to the Staff Report. *See PUD*, Slip Op. at 19604-06. Rather than consider its discussion of the dysfunction in the forward market, FERC treated the Staff Report's conclusions as only relevant if it was *first* determined that just and reasonable review is applicable, the same way it treated other evidence of market dysfunction. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,415 & n.38. This was error. *See PUD*, Slip Op. at 19606 ("[T]he questions raised by the Staff Report—whether and how the manipulated spot market influenced the forward markets—*are* relevant to determining whether the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies, because they raise questions about the market conditions at the time of contract formation and thus about the propriety of relying on a regime of market-based rate authority at that time to produce just and reasonable rates.").

FERC also affirmed the ALJ's exclusion of some of PUC's other evidence—including testimony of expert witnesses—regarding the effect of spot market manipulation on forward prices. As *PUD* makes clear, such evidence is essential to the question of whether the forward energy market was sufficiently well-functioning to apply *Mobile-Sierra*. *See id.*, Slip Op. at 19605-06.

On remand, FERC should consider the excluded evidence, as well as all other relevant evidence--whether part of the "100 Day Proceeding" or not--before determining whether the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption applies.

3. *Effect on the "Public Interest"*

Consistent with *PUD*, "FERC's error in its approach to deciding *whether* to apply the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption was compounded by it use of an erroneous standard for determining whether the challenged contracts affect the public interest." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19606-07. "In its efforts to

determine the impact on the public interest under *Mobile-Sierra* ... FERC relied on the wrong legal standard, applying factors taken from the context of a *low-rate* challenge rather than those relevant to the *high-rate* challenge present in this case." *Id.*, Slip Op. at 19607.

FERC determined that the challenged contracts in this case did not affect the public interest because PUC:

> presented very little evidence relevant to the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review. Based on the record, we conclude that Complainants have failed to demonstrate that any of the three prongs announced in the *Sierra* case has been met or that any other factor introduced into evidence warrants a finding that any of the contracts is contrary to the public interest and should be modified.[9]

Pub. Utils. Comm'n, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,415. FERC determined that because consumers did not face an "excessive burden" whether consumers endured *any* burden was inapposite. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 105 F.E.R.C. 61,182, at ¶¶ 66-67. As we explained in *PUD*, this determination fundamentally misunderstands the public interest inquiry in the context of a high-rate challenge. *See PUD*, Slip Op. at 19607-11.

Under California law, all costs of the challenged contracts were passed on to consumers. *See* CAL. WATER CODE § 80104. The parties debate whether retail power rates in fact increased after the parties signed these contracts, but this dispute is not determinative. Even if rates did not increase in the months after CDWR signed the contracts, the retail rates charged consumers because of

---

[9] In such circumstances [when the public interest test satisfies the Commission's duty to ensure just and reasonable rates] the sole concern of the Commission would seem to be whether the rate is so low as to adversely affect the public interest—as where it might impair the financial ability of the public utility to continue its service, cast upon other consumers an excessive burden, or be unduly discriminatory.

Sierra, 350 U.S. at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368.

these contracts might have been higher than they would have been had the wholesale contract rates been lower. *See PUD*, Slip Op. at 19609 ("[I]f a challenged contract imposes any significant cost on ultimate customers because of a wholesale rate too high to be within a zone of reasonableness, that contract affects the public interest." (citations omitted)).

III.

Finally, we grant PUC's petition as it relates to FERC's dismissal of its complaint regarding CDWR's contract with PPM. FERC's decision to dismiss the case against the PPM contract without a hearing may be affirmed only if FERC addressed all "relevant factors in dispute and ... a formal hearing was unnecessary for the Commission to reach its conclusion." *Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 746 F.2d 1383, 1386 (9th Cir.1984). We believe FERC failed to address all relevant factors here.

FERC dismissed the PPM challenge because the parties entered the contract after FERC's June 19 Order. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 99 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,087, at¶¶ 61,383-84 (2002). FERC did not consider, however, whether some market dysfunction may have lingered after that order took effect. PPM, intervening in this case, argues that the chronology of its contract factually distinguishes it from the other challenged contracts. We disagree.

It is not at all clear that the forward markets had stabilized by the date when the parties entered the PPM contract. On the contrary, FERC's Staff Report concluded that contracts entered after June 19, 2001, "generally show a persistence of the effects found during the crisis, i.e., statistically significant positive elasticities of the forward price with respect to the spot price." Staff Report at V-14. While the Staff Report qualified its conclusion regarding post-June 19 effects of market power, noting that, "[o]n average," post-June 19 contracts demonstrated a lesser effect from the spot markets than pre-June 19 contracts, FERC should have at least considered the possibility that ill

effects remained. Therefore, the agency's dismissal of the challenge was inappropriate.

IV.

For the foregoing reasons, we determine that a remand is necessary so that FERC can apply the proper statutory standards to determine, first, whether *Mobile-Sierra* review of the challenged contracts is appropriate; second, if so, to apply the modified form of *Mobile-Sierra* review outlined in *PUD* and referenced in this opinion; and finally, if not, to apply full just and reasonable review to the challenged contracts.

PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED AND REMANDED.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California
v.
Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-60-000

California Electricity Oversight Board
v.
Sellers of Energy and Capacity Under Long-Term Contracts With the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-62-000 (Consolidated)

ORDER SETTING COMPLAINTS FOR HEARING, ESTABLISHING HEARING PROCEDURES, AND CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS

(Issued April 25, 2002)

99 FERC ¶ 61,087

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, Linda Breathitt, and Nora Mead Brownell.

On February 25, 2002, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) and the California Electricity Oversight Board (CEOB) filed two separate, almost identical, complaints against a group of sellers of energy under long-term contracts with the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) alleging that the

prices, terms, and conditions of such contracts are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest. The complaints also allege that the respondents obtained the prices, terms, and conditions in the contracts through the exercise of market power, in violation of the Federal Power Act (FPA), and the respondents' actions are causing injury to the citizens and ratepayers of California on whose behalf the CPUC is statutorily entitled to act.

To ensure that the complainants have a full and fair opportunity to present their cases and that the Commission, in turn, has a complete record on which to base its ultimate decision, we are setting these complaints for an evidentiary hearing. During this hearing, the complainants will bear the burden of proving that modification of contracts is justified. This burden is a heavy one and one that the evidence contained in the complaints taken alone does not meet. Moreover, to aid the parties in settling their disputes without the burden and expenses of litigation, we will hold the hearing in abeyance pending the outcome of settlement judge procedures. For each complaint, we also establish a refund effective date pursuant to Section 206(b) of the Federal Power Act (FPA).[1]

I. COMPLAINTS

The complaints seek to modify over 30 contracts[2] with numerous sellers.[3] These contracts were entered into in 2001. Some of the contracts have concluded and others are

---

[1] 16 U.S.C. § 824e(b) (1994).

[2] Not all of these contracts may be potentially subject to refund. For a detailed list of contracts being addressed in this order, *see* Appendix A. According to the announcement on the CDWR's official website, CDWR has renegotiated some of the contracts that the instant complaints seek to modify. The contracts that appear to have been renegotiated and superseded are not addressed in this order and instead will be addressed in a future order, to the extent necessary. http://wwwcers.water.ca.gov/newContracts.html (April 23, 2002).

[3] For a complete list of the respondents *see* Appendix B.

yet to become effective and will continue through year 2021. The contract prices range from a low of $25.16 to a high of $249.

The complainants request that these contracts be abrogated as unjust and unreasonable and that the Commission establish a refund effective date at the earliest time permitted by law. In the alternative, they ask that the Commission reform the contracts to provide for just and reasonable rates, reduce their duration, and strike certain non-price terms and provisions from the contracts.

The complaints state that CDWR was forced to pay unjust and unreasonable prices and to agree to onerous, unjust and unreasonable non-price terms,[4] in order to secure the power necessary to ensure that the lights stayed on in California. The complainants allege that the prices, terms, and conditions in each challenged contract are tainted with the exercise of market power.

Both CPUC and CEOB argue that the applicable standard of review in the instant case is whether the rates are just and reasonable and that the complaints are not barred by the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine.[5] They contend that because neither the complainants nor the consumers they represent are signatories to any of the challenged contracts, they are not bound by a "public interest" standard. CEOB also argues that the "public interest" standard does not apply to contracts that are, as they are here, being reviewed by the Commission for the first time.

In the alternative, CPUC and CEOB argue that even if the "public interest" standard is applicable, the challenged contracts must be abrogated as contrary to the public

---

[4] CPUC and CEOB challenge non-price terms concerning: (1) priority over bond repayment; (2) dispatchability of block contracts; (3) evasion of the effect of Commission review; (4) asymmetrical credit treatment; (5) "most-favored nation" treatment; (6) mitigation and termination; and (7) asymmetrical allocation of future governmental action.

[5] *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) (*Mobile*); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956) (*Sierra*).

interest. Citing *Northeast Utilities Service Co. v. FERC*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332 (1994), *aff'd*, 55 F.3d 686 (D.C. Cir. 1995) and *PJM Interconnection, LLC*, 96 FERC ¶ 61, 206 (2001), the complainants contend that the "public interest" standard can be met in a Section 206 complaint by third parties who are "threatened by possible 'undue discrimination' or imposition of an excessive burden." CPUC believes that the contract rates are excessively burdensome on California customers not only because they are "catastrophically uneconomic," but also because of the highly asymmetrical distribution of burdens and benefits in the contract terms and conditions.

CPUC further argues that the contract rates can be determined to be unlawful without a finding of market power abuse. It explains that the contracts at issue were negotiated when the energy markets were dysfunctional. CPUC believes that CDWR made excessive contract payments as measured against market benchmarks, estimated cost of service, and the Commission-proposed benchmark.[6]

Additionally, CPUC requests that the instant complaints be set for hearing before the same judge who will conduct a hearing in Docket No. EL02-26-000, *et al.*[7] and that the Commission take official notice of all pleadings and evidence filed to date in those dockets.

II. RESPONSIVE PLEADINGS

Sunrise Power Company, LLC (Sunrise), Pacificorp Power Marketing, Inc. (PPM), Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc. (Morgan Stanley), and Colton Power, L.P.

---

[6] *See San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at pp. 61,994-95 (2000), *reh'g denied*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,275, at p. 62,229 (2001) (setting a benchmark for five-year contracts for supply around-the-clock at $74/MWh).

[7] *Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company v. Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C., et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,047 (2002).

(Colton)[8] filed motions requesting dismissal of the complaints. In addition, Coral Power, L.L.C. (Coral) and PG&E Energy Trading-Power, LP (PG&E) argue that the instant complaints should be dismissed for failure to state a claim because most of the complainants' allegations are directed either at the Commission or CDWR and that the complaints fail to allege any specific violation of the Federal Power Act,[9] Commission orders or regulations.

Sunrise, PPM, Morgan Stanley, Calpeak Project Companies (Calpeak), Constellation Power Source, Inc. and High Desert Power Project, LLC (collectively, Constellation), Sempra Energy Resources (SER), Clearwood Electric Company, LLC (Clearwood), GWF Energy LLC (GWF), Fresno Cogeneration Partners, LP, Wellhead Power Gates LLC and Wellhead Power Panoche LLC (collectively, Wellhead Companies), and Calpine Energy Services, L.P. (Calpine) argue that the complainants lack standing and/or authority under the California law to challenge the contracts in question because CDWR is the only party authorized under the California law to determine whether its power purchase contracts are just and reasonable. Sunrise adds that the complainants cannot even be considered third-party beneficiaries because the contracts at issue were negotiated by representatives of the State of California for the benefit of the State of California, not the complainants.

In response, CEOB argues that Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.206, permits any person, including state or state entity, to file a complaint even where that person does not possess a direct interest in the transactions, so long as the person is adversely affected by the actions that are subject to the complaints. It further states that the Commission

---

[8] Colton is a successor in interest to Alliance Colton LLC.

[9] 16 U.S.C. § 796 *et seq.* (1994).

cannot be required to interpret the scope and powers granted to the CEOB by the California legislature.

Furthermore, Clearwood, Sunrise, Morgan Stanley, Constellation, Calpeak, SER, GWF, Calpeak, Calpine, Wellhead Companies, Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company (Williams), and Mirant America Energy Marketing, LP (Mirant), El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. (El Paso), Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc. (Dynegy),[10] Colton, and Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C. and Primary Power International (collectively, IVRRC), and Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC (Allegheny) argue that the complainants have failed to meet the "practically insurmountable" *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard. Morgan Stanley, Williams, and GWF contend that the *Mobile-Sierra* standard cannot be met by the complainants pursuant to the equitable principle of "unclean hands," since the complainants themselves created the dysfunctional market conditions that led to the shortages and high spot prices they now seek to use as justification for abrogating the contracts at issue. Williams, Dynegy, and El Paso further state that in accordance with Commission and court precedent, the fact that the challenged contracts have allegedly become uneconomic to the State does not render these contracts contrary to the public interest. Calpine asserts that a mere showing of a disparity between contract and market rates does not satisfy the *Mobile-Sierra* standard. Certain respondents also disagree with the complainants' claim that the contracts in question are being reviewed by the Commission for the first time, when in fact, the long-term contracts have been filed with the Commission and the short-term transactions have been submitted in quarterly transaction summaries. In response, the complainants state that the contracts at issue should be reviewed under the just and reasonable standard because

---

[10] Dynegy filed an answer to the complaints jointly with El Segundo Power LLC, Long Beach Generation LLC, and Cabrillo Power LLC.

the Commission has not substantively reviewed the CDWR contracts.

Moreover, in response to the complainants' argument that they are not bound by the public interest standard because they represent third-party interests in these proceedings, Constellation and Morgan Stanley argue that the Commission should not permit the State of California to evade the *Mobile-Sierra* requirement by executing binding contracts through one agency and then, later, attacking those contracts through another agency ostensibly representing the same interests. Coral states that the complainants' participation in this proceeding should be deemed in the same capacity as CDWR, not as a disinterested party. Williams also argues that CDWR acted as an agent of the State in negotiating and executing the contracts at issue and that the complainants, which also represent the State, are not third parties to the CDWR contracts and thus are bound by these contracts. In Williams' opinion, the fact that the complaints are submitted by sister agencies is immaterial.

In response, the CPUC argues that it is not a party to the CDWR contracts and as an independent, constitutionally established state agency, it is neither liable for nor bound by CDWR's actions in signing the contracts at issue. The CPUC and CEOB further assert that the respondents' argument that one state agency can contractually bind other state agencies is not supported by legal authority.

Calpeak, SER, and Morgan Stanley also argue that the Commission's statement that any party believing that forward contract rates are unjust and unreasonable could file a FPA Section 206 complaint does not operate to excuse the complainants from the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard. In addition, Mirant, Williams, Wellhead Companies, and Calpine state that their contracts with CDWR contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* clause, which precludes CDWR from unilaterally seeking changes to the contract terms under either Section 205 or 206 of the FPA,

as well as makes the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard applicable to challenges by third parties, including this Commission, the State of California, any of its agencies, or any other governmental entity.[11]

Morgan Stanley, GWF, Calpine, Dynegy, Colton, and Constellation further argue that the Commission's failure to uphold the contracts in question would chill participation in forward markets, deter generation investment, and result in filing of ripple claims by numerous market participants seeking to mitigate their refund exposure. Mirant and SER also assert that by abrogating the contracts at issue, the Commission will send the CDWR straight back to the spot market, which is bound to experience steep price increases and renewed volatility due to the return of all of the power needs currently covered by the long-term contracts.

Sunrise, Clearwood, PPM, Calpeak, Morgan Stanley, Constellation, Mirant, GWF, SER, Calpine, Williams, Dynegy, IVRRC, Allegheny, and El Paso further argue that the complainants did not offer evidence showing that the contracts at issue are unjust and unreasonable or otherwise unlawful and that the respondents exercised market power. Allegheny challenges the complainants' inference that market prices were unjust and unreasonable because after the Commission imposed the West-wide price mitigation by its June 19, 2001 Order (June 19 Order),[12] they started declining. It argues that the prices had already declined by the time of issuance of the June 19 Order and that the decline was attributable to the actions of the State of

---

11 *See* Answer of Calpine Energy Services, L.P., Docket No. EL02-60-000, at 20 (March 26, 2002); Answer of Mirant-Americas Energy Marketing, LP to Complaints, Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000, Attachment A, Exhibit A, ¶ 6 (March 22, 2002); and Answer of Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company, Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000, at 24 (March 22, 2002).

12 *San Diego & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001).

California in moving to longer-term contracts, to conservation efforts and decline in natural gas prices.

Additionally, PPM, Calpeak, SER, El Paso, and Morgan Stanley assert that the rates offered by sellers with market-based pricing authority are presumed to be just and reasonable, and that the complainants failed to overcome this presumption. GWF and SER add that challenging individual contracts entered into pursuant to market-based tariffs is inconsistent with the underlying principles upon which the Commission grants market-based rate authority. Moreover, Coral states that the prices in its contracts with CDWR are lawful because they were authorized by and complied with rate schedules accepted by the Commission.[13] Thus, it concludes, the contract prices are protected by the filed rate doctrine.[14]

Furthermore, Calpeak argues that the comparison offered by the complainants of contract rates with various market benchmarks, including the Commission's advisory benchmark,[15] does not prove that the contracts at issue are unlawful. In SER's and Allegheny's opinion, the complainants' comparison of contract rates in question with the after-the-fact, cost-based benchmarks constitutes a collateral assault on the Commission's market-based rate regime. Mirant further states that the Commission adopted the advisory benchmark in order to encourage the use of forward contracts, not to set a cap on long-term forward market rates. Williams, Allegheny, and PG&E, however, state that the rates in the CDWR contracts fall within or are below the Commission's advisory benchmark for long-term contracts. Allegheny concludes that the rates in its

---

13 Coral Power, L.L.C., Answer in Opposition to Complaint, Docket No. EL02-62-000, at 17 ¶ 47 (March 22, 2002).

14 *Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. v. Hall*, 453 U.S. 571, 577 (1981) (explaining that the filed rate doctrine forbids a regulated entity from charging rates for its services other than those properly filed with the appropriate regulatory authority).

15 *See supra* n.6.

contracts with CDWR are thus presumptively just and reasonable.

In addition, SER argues that it could not have exercised market power because it owns no generation in the relevant geographic area and that it would be in no position to exercise market power against CDWR, the largest power purchaser in California. Calpine asserts that it also lacks market power because its sales to CDWR are sales of capacity from new generating facilities constructed after the effective date of Order No. 888.[16] According to Calpine, sales from capacity for which construction has commenced on or after Order No. 888 are presumed to lack generation dominance. In addition, GWF and Calpine assert that CDWR was ably represented, had significant bargaining advantages, and proposed many terms that were eventually included in its contract with GWF. Constellation, El Paso, and Mirant state that certain non-price provisions being challenged in the complaints were specifically requested by CDWR and adopted virtually unchanged.[17] Soledad

---

16 *Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities; Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities*, Order No. 888, 61 *Fed. Reg.* 21,540, at pp. 31,664-65 (1996), *FERC Statutes and Regulations, Regulations Preambles January 1991-June 1996* ¶ 31,036 (1996), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-A, 62 *Fed. Reg.* 12,274 (1997), *FERC Statutes and Regulations, Regulations Preambles July 1996-December 2000.* ¶ 31,048 (1997), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-B, 81 FERC ¶ 61,248 (1997), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-C, 82 FERC ¶ 61,046 (1998), *aff'd in relevant part, remanded in part on other grounds sub nom. Transmission Access Policy Study Group, et al. v. FERC*, 225 F. 3d 667 (D.C. Cir. 2000), *aff'd, New York v. FERC*, 122 S.Ct. 1012 (2002).

17 *E.g.*, Mirant identifies the following provisions as having been requested by CDWR: the bond priority provision, creditworthiness provision, and the *Mobile-Sierra* clause. Answer of Mirant-Americas Energy Marketing, LP to Complaints, Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000, at 34-36 (March 22, 2002). Further, according to El Paso, CDWR proposed the inclusion of the bond priority clause, the "most-favored nation" provision, and an asymmetrical credit treatment clause. Answer of El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. to Complaint, Docket No. EL02-62-000, at 15 (March 22, 2002).

Energy, LLC (Soledad) asserts that its contract with CDWR was essentially dictated in its entirety by CDWR. Moreover, it adds, certain non-price terms of its contract were unilaterally changed by CDWR after the parties had reached a final agreement. SER also states that its contract with CDWR was the product of nearly three months of negotiations. Wellhead Companies also state that the complainants had many bidders to choose from and selected the most favorable bids and entered into contracts after further negotiations. According to Allegheny, Constellation, and GWF, the Commission has determined that during the same period of time when the CDWR was negotiating the contracts at issue, it enjoyed an undue competitive advantage, given its level of access to non-public material information unavailable to other market participants.[18] In addition, Williams and Allegheny argue that the risk and benefits of the contracts at issue should be examined over their respective terms because these contracts, as all other risk management products, are designed to accommodate swings in market prices, both up and down.

The CPUC counters the respondents' allegations that the CDWR exerted monopsony power in the long-term contract negotiations. It states that while the CDWR was certainly a large buyer, it was not the only one during the relevant time period. It also adds that the respondents were under no obligation to offer power to the CDWR, which at the time was faced with serving many thousands of MW of demand or see the lights to go out in California.

Clearwood, PPM, Calpeak, GWF, SER, Calpine, PG&E, Colton, Allegheny, and Constellation also challenge the complainants' assertion that the contract prices were the result of the dysfunctional spot market, which caused volatility and dysfunctions in the forward markets. They contend that this statement is inconsistent with the

---

[18] They cite *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,120, at p. 61,515 (2001) (July 25, 2001 Order).

Commission's prior orders limiting the mitigation to spot markets.[19] Mirant argues that when the Commission identified "critical interdependence" between spot and forward markets in the June 19 Order,[20] it, in fact, recognized that price mitigation in spot markets "will, over time, impact bilateral and forward markets." Moreover, Morgan Stanley argues that the CPUC and CEOB have failed to demonstrate that spot market prices are the predominant factor driving forward contract prices and other terms and conditions. It explains that many factors play a role in establishing a forward price curve, including the cost to build new generation, expected power supplies, economic conditions and weather forecasts. Allegheny also states that the complainants offered no evidence in support of their claim that forward markets were not competitive. According to Allegheny, the fact that CDWR has contracts with 23 suppliers demonstrates robust competition in the long-term bilateral market. Wellhead Companies also argue that contrary to the complainants' allegations, the bilateral markets are functional and competitive. They explain that the long-term forward contracts executed by CDWR were a primary cause of the spot price stability and of the addition of new generating capacity into the California markets.

Sunrise, PPM, Soledad, and Calpeak request that the Commission establish separate proceedings for the complaints against them.[21] Sunrise, PPM, and Calpeak explain that their contracts with CDWR were entered into

---

19 They cite *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,257 (2001) (December 19 Order) and *San Diego & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001) (June 19 Order).

20 *San Diego & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001).

21 Sunrise Power Company, LLC filed separately a Motion to Establish a Separate Proceeding for Complaints against Sunrise and for Consolidation, Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000 (March 19, 2002). PPM's Answer to Complaints also contains a motion to bifurcate.

after the issuance of the June 19 Order imposing mitigation on West-wide markets.[22] Soledad states that its facility is unique in its small size and impact on the market. Sunrise and Soledad also contend that their contracts with CDWR have cost-based, not market-based pricing. PPM argues that the Commission should establish separate proceedings for contracts with each seller because these contracts have no factual commonality.

Constellation and Coral filed an answer in opposition to PPM's motion to bifurcate stating that such an approach would be wasteful and cause delay, since the complaints are flawed and can easily be dismissed without reaching any specific conclusions regarding individual contracts. The complainants also oppose the requests to bifurcate the complaints into multiple proceedings. In addition, they argue that the Commission should not exclude from the instant proceeding the contracts entered into after June 20, 2001. They explain that each of the challenged contracts was negotiated prior to the imposition of the West-wide mitigation by means of an initial "letter of intent" that set forth the terms and conditions of a transaction.

Sempra filed an answer to the CPUC's request that the instant complaints be consolidated with the ongoing proceedings in Docket Nos. EL02-26-000, *et al.* Sempra asserts that such consolidation would serve no useful purpose because those proceedings involve transactions subject to the Western States Power Pool Agreement.

Additionally, El Paso requests that if the Commission institutes a FPA Section 206 investigation, it must establish a refund effective date at the latest time permitted by law. El Paso explains that if it were to file ripple complaints, the refund effective date for those complaints could be no sooner than mid-June, leaving El Paso with close to two months of refund exposure without potential offset from its own suppliers. El Paso also states that the Commission should

---

22 *See supra* n.20.

de-link the Staff Investigation established by the February 13, 2002 Order. It reasons that the Staff Investigation centers on alleged activities of a single market participant, while the instant proceedings are predicated on allegations of potentially unjust and unreasonable rates in long-term power sales contracts.

1. *Comments*

Independent Energy Producers Association, Electric Power Supply Association, and Western Power Trading Forum (collectively, Joint Parties) argue that the instant complaints should be dismissed because under the California law and Commission precedent, the complainants have no authority to evaluate wholesale rates in CDWR's contracts. Reliant Energy Power Generation, Inc. and Reliant Energy Resources (collectively, Reliant Companies) further argue that the complaints are barred by the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine. They state that regardless of whether Commission review is sought by a contracting party or a third party, the applicable standard is whether modification of the contract is required by the public interest.

In addition, Indigo Generation LLC, Larkspur Energy LLC and Wildflower Energy, LP, and Joint Parties state that abrogating these contracts could plunge California into a new round of crisis that would further destabilize the regional marketplace. Joint Parties also claim that granting the requested remedies will dissuade future suppliers from entering the market and doing business in California and will disrupt current contract negotiations underway recently imposed by the CPUC. Reliant Companies add that abrogation of the contracts would essentially convert long-term contracts into a "call" option from which a purchaser may alter its forward contracts according to a contemporary view of the market.

Reliant Companies and Joint Parties also argue that contrary to the complainants' assertion that CDWR was forced into signing any deal, the CDWR was fully capable of negotiating terms and conditions, and that the State actually

touted the contracts at issue as highly beneficial. Also, Joint Parties suggest that, when examining the contracts at issue, the Commission should not ignore the market conditions that were in effect at the time the contracts were entered into, namely that there was a scarcity of available generation in the region.

The California State Assembly (Assembly) supports the complaints. It states that the complainants have established a *prima facie* case. The Assembly also claims that the respondents' actions are causing injury to the citizens of California and that the contracts should be abrogated or, in the alternative, reformed in accordance with the mandates of the FPA.

III. NOTICE, INTERVENTIONS, COMMENTS, AND PROTESTS

Notice of the CPUC's complaint in Docket No. EL02-60-000 was published in the *Federal Register*, 67 *Fed. Reg.* 9,728 (2002), with comments, protests, or interventions due on or before March 4, 2002. Notice of the CEOB's complaint in Docket No. EL02-62-000 was published in the *Federal Register*, 67 *Fed. Reg.* 9,727 (2002), with comments, protests, or interventions due on or before March 4, 2002. The comment period in both dockets was subsequently extended until March 22, 2002.

Timely motions to intervene were filed by entities listed in the Appendix C to this order. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2001), the filing of a timely motion to intervene that has not been opposed makes the movant a party to the proceeding. Certain parties filed late motions to intervene in this proceeding. Given the lack of undue prejudice and the parties' interests, we find good cause to grant under Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2001), the unopposed, untimely motions to intervene in this proceeding.

CPUC and CEOB files answers to certain motions and to other responsive pleadings. Sempra also filed an answer

to the complainants' answers. We will allow these filings, as the Commission permits parties to respond to answers only when doing so, as here, will assist the Commission's understanding of the issues raised.[23]

IV. DISCUSSION

Certain respondents contend that under the California law, CPUC and CEOB do not have the authority to review rates in CDWR's contracts. We find these contentions to be irrelevant in this proceeding because CPUC and CEOB request Commission review of the CDWR contract rates, rather than attempt to examine the same on their own.[24] We therefore believe that CPUC and CEOB have standing to submit the instant complaints pursuant to Section 306 of the FPA,[25] which states in pertinent part:

> Any person, State, municipality, or State commission complaining of anything done or omitted to be done by any licensee or public utility in contravention of the provisions of this chapter may apply to the Commission ...

We, however, find that in the instant proceeding, CPUC and CEOB act in the same capacity as CDWR. Based on the fact that in negotiating and executing the contacts at issue, CDWR represented the State of California, CPUC and CEOB, which are also State representatives, "stepped into the shoes" of CDWR by bringing these complaints. Thus, the same standard of review applies to these complainants as would apply to a similar complaint filed by CDWR.

---

23 *See, e.g., Atlantic City Electric Co.*, 90 FERC ¶ 61,268, at 61,898 (2000) and *New York Independent System Operator, Inc.*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,128 (2000).

24 We believe that a state court is the proper forum to address the issue of whether the CPUC and CEOB have the authority under the California law to challenge rates in CDWR's contracts and/or take other action in regard to those contracts.

25 16 U.S.C. § 825e (1994).

In their complaints, CPUC and CEOB seek the extraordinary remedy of contract modification. The Commission's long-standing policy, consistent with a substantial body of Supreme Court and other judicial precedent, has been to recognize the sanctity of contracts. Rarely has the Commission deviated from that policy, and then only in extreme circumstances, such as the fundamental industry-wide restructuring under Order No. 888 and the reorganization of a bankrupt utility.[26] Preservation of contracts has, if anything, become even more critical since the policy was first adopted. Competitive power markets simply cannot attract the capital needed to build adequate generating infrastructure without regulatory certainty, including certainty that the Commission will not modify market-based contracts unless there are *extraordinary* circumstances.

As discussed below, the Commission has determined that, based on the unusual circumstances presented, it is appropriate to set the contracts listed in Appendix A for hearing. As an initial matter, in these dockets, parties have argued extensively over whether the complainants should be bound to a *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" burden of proof or a "just and reasonable" burden of proof to support reformation of the contracts. Certain contracts identified by the complainants appear to have a specific contractual provision which addresses FPA Sections 205 and 206 rights of the parties to these contracts, as well as the Section 206 rights of third parties.[27] For these contracts (listed under a

---

26 *See* Order No. 888, *supra* n.16, at pp. 31,664-65; and *Northeast Util. Serv. Co.*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332, *reh'g denied*, 68 FERC ¶ 61,041 (1994).

27 *E.g.*, Section 10.13(c) of CDWR's contract with Allegheny states: "The Agreement should not be subject to change by application of either Party pursuant to the provisions of Section 205 or 206 of the Federal Power Act ..., absent the agreement of both Parties in a written amendment executed by both parties." Also, Section 10.14 of the CDWR/Williams contract states: "The terms and conditions and the rates for service specified herein shall remain in effect for the term of each Transaction hereunder, and shall not be subject to change through

separate subheading in Appendix A) the complainants must satisfy the public interest standard to justify contract modification.

As for the contracts that do not contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision, we do not believe that we have a sufficient record to address the *Mobile-Sierra* issue definitively and, accordingly, we will set for hearing the issue of whether the complainants must bear the burden of showing that a challenged contract is contrary to the public interest, or whether they will bear the burden of showing that the contract is not just and reasonable. However, it is our view that even under a "just and reasonable" burden of proof standard, parties who seek to overturn market-based contracts into which they voluntarily entered will bear a heavy burden. In the evidence presented thus far, the complainants have failed to show that the dysfunctional California Independent System Operator (ISO) and Power Exchange (PX) spot markets had an adverse effect on the long-term, bilateral markets in California. To meet any burden of proof to reform these market-based contracts, complainants will need to demonstrate that there was such an adverse effect and, if there was, that the effect was of a magnitude warranting modification of contracts entered into in the bilateral markets. Given the importance of these questions, we have decided it is appropriate to order a full evidentiary hearing. This hearing is designed to ensure that the complainants have a full and fair opportunity to present their cases, and that the Commission in turn, has a complete record on which to base its ultimate decision.[28]

---

application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by either Party, including any Governmental Agency, pursuant to the provisions of Section 205 or 206 of the Federal Power Act. Each Party expressly agrees that it will not make any filings under either Section 205 or 206 of the Federal Power Act to revise this rate schedule.

[28] By order issued on February 13, 2002, the Commission directed a staff investigation of potential manipulation of electric and natural gas prices in the West. We are setting the instant contracts for hearing under Section 206 of the FPA based on the arguments that the

Therefore, we set for hearing the contracts listed in Appendix A to this order. These include only those contracts that were entered into before June 20, 2001, the date on which the Commission's West-wide mitigation went into effect.[29] CEOB argues that all of the contracts included in its complaint should be set for hearing because each of the challenged contracts was negotiated prior to the imposition of West-wide mitigation. CEOB, however, offers no evidence showing that CDWR was bound to proceed with execution of the contracts after the West-wide mitigation went into effect. Contracts entered into after the date the West-wide mitigation went into effect are not set for hearing, since the effect of the West-wide mitigation was to stabilize prices. Also, we set for hearing only those contracts that have not yet concluded. The Commission in this context has no authority to order refunds for contracts or transactions that conclude prior to the refund effective date. Our authority to modify the long-term contracts at issue here is only from the refund effective date forward.

The hearing is limited to the question of whether the dysfunctional California spot markets[30] adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted. The hearing will not address issues concerning the Commission's policies on granting market-based rate authority or on regulation of sellers with such authority.

---

dysfunctional spot markets in California caused long-term contracts not to be reasonable, whereas the investigation is looking at whether there was improper behavior by sellers that may have caused prices not to be reasonable.

29 *San Diego & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001).

30 Spot markets or spot market sales are sales that are 24 hours or less and that are entered into the day of or day prior to delivery. *See San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,120, at p. 61,515 (2001); *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418, at p. 62,545 n.3 (2001).

Further, if the judge concludes that modification of one or more of the contracts is warranted, the judge should not attempt at this stage to determine how those contracts should be modified.

We expect the parties to present evidence on and direct the judge to consider the totality of purchases and sales and the conditions present at the time the contracts were entered into. In particular, the judge's review should include, but is not limited to, consideration of: CDWR's overall portfolio as well as its own sales, if any (*e.g.*, pattern, duration, price); whether CDWR's transactions were physical or financial in nature and designed to serve CDWR's load or the net short position of Southern California Edison Company and Pacific Gas and Electric Company; the terms, conditions and rate over the entire duration of each contract (*e.g.*, whether the contract is front-end loaded); the risks and benefits of the contracts at issue over their respective terms; what other alternatives were available to buyers and sellers; whether, at the time, it was a reasonable decision to enter into these contracts (*e.g.*, duration, scope and time period, and the participants' expectations as to the duration of dysfunctions in the California ISO and PX markets); previously submitted testimony by CDWR on the justness and reasonableness of the contracts at issue; the terms and conditions of any request for proposals, and the process and procedures CDWR used to evaluate the contracts, including any changes in offered rates, terms, and conditions mandated or negotiated by CDWR; whether any non-price terms were adopted upon CDWR's request; whether CDWR had access to inside information from the ISO *or* had a market position that it could potentially use to gain advantage in contract negotiations, and whether it in fact used that information; the relation of the contract rates to the Commission's previously identified benchmark for long-term contracts.[31]

---

[31] *See San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at pp. 61,994-95 (2000), *reh'g*

In addition, the parties may present evidence on: the effect of the contracts on the financial health of California and other states; the effect of the contracts on wholesale and retail customers; the impacts contract modification may have on the nation's energy markets, including, but not limited to, impacts on investment in new generation and transmission infrastructure, and effect on confidence in competitive markets; the impact of contract modification on California spot market prices; the willingness of market participants to enter into long-term contracts in the future and the prices and terms and conditions of such contracts; and the potential modification of other existing energy contracts.

That being said, we want to strongly encourage all parties involved in disputes arising from the California crisis to seriously negotiate settlements. The uncertainty and expense of continued litigation over these disputes serves the interests of neither the parties to those disputes nor the public. For this reason, we will hold the hearing in abeyance and direct settlement judge procedures pursuant to Rule 603 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.[32] The Chief Judge shall appoint a settlement judge in this proceeding within 15 days of the date of issuance of this order. The settlement judge shall report to the Chief Judge and the Commission within 30 days of the date of this order concerning the status of settlement discussions. Based on this report, the Chief Judge shall provide the parties with additional time to continue their settlement discussions or provide for commencement of a hearing by assigning the case to a presiding judge.

In cases where, as here, the Commission institutes an investigation on complaint under Section 206 of the FPA, Section 206(b) requires that the Commission establish a refund effective date that is no earlier than 60 days after the

---

denied, 97 FERC ¶ 61,275, at p. 62,229 (2001) (setting a benchmark for five-year contracts for supply around-the-clock at $74/MWh).

32 18 C.F.R. § 385.603 (2001).

filing of the complaint, but no later than five months subsequent to the expiration of the 60-day period. Consistent with our general policy of providing maximum protection to customers,[33] we will set the refund effective date as of the date 60 days after the date of the filing of each complaint, *i.e.*, on April 26, 2002.

Section 206(b) also requires that, if no final decision is rendered by the refund effective date or by the conclusion of the 180-day period commencing upon initiation of a proceeding pursuant to Section 206, whichever is earlier, the Commission shall state the reasons why it has failed to do so and shall state the best estimate as to when it reasonably expects to make such a decision. Ordinarily, to implement that requirement, we would direct the presiding judge to provide a report to the Commission in advance of the refund effective date. Here, given that the refund effective date for all the complaints has already passed, the Commission cannot follow its normal procedure.

Although we do not have the benefit of the presiding judge's report, based on our review of the record, we expect that, assuming the cases do not settle, the presiding judge should be able to render a decision within eight months of the commencement of hearing procedures. If the presiding judge is able to render an initial decision by December 31, 2002 and assuming the cases do not settle, we estimate that we will be able to issue our decision within approximately three months of the filing of briefs on and opposing exceptions or by May 31, 2003.

Given the overlap of issues and factual inquiries, we will consolidate the instant complaints for purposes of hearing. In addition, we will leave it to the discretion of the Chief Administrative Law Judge to determine whether, when and to what extent it may be appropriate to consolidate the

---

[33] *See, e.g., Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. v. Florida Power & Light Company*, 65 FERC ¶ 61,413, at p. 63,139 (1993); *Canal Electric Company*, 46 FERC ¶ 61,153, at p. 61,539, *reh'g denied*, 47 FERC ¶ 61,275 (1989).

instant complaints with the ongoing proceeding in Docket Nos. EL02-26-000, EL02-28-000, EL02-29-000, EL02-30-000, EL02-31-000, EL02-32-000, EL02-33-000, EL02-34-000, EL02-38-000, EL02-39-000, EL02-43-000, and EL02-56-000.[34]

The Commission orders:

(A) Pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Section 402(a) of the Department of Energy Organization Act and the Federal Power Act, particularly Section 206 thereof, and pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and the regulations under the Federal Power Act (18 C.F.R. Chapter 1), the captioned dockets are consolidated, and an expedited public hearing shall be held concerning the complaints in these proceedings. As discussed in the body of this order, we will hold the hearing in abeyance to give the parties time to conduct settlement judge negotiations, as discussed in Paragraphs (B) and (C).

(B) Pursuant to Rule 603 of the Commission's Rule of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.603 (2001), the Chief Administrative Law Judge is hereby directed and authorized to appoint a settlement judge in this proceeding within fifteen (15) days of the date of this order. Such settlement judge shall have all powers and duties enumerated in Rule 603 and shall convene a settlement conference as soon as practicable after the Chief Judge designates the settlement judge.

(C) Within thirty (30) days of the date of this order, the settlement judge shall file a report with the Commission and the Chief Judge on the status of the settlement discussions. Based on this report, the Chief Judge shall provide the parties with additional time to continue their settlement discussions, if appropriate, or assign this case to a presiding

---

[34] 18 C.F.R. § 385.503 (2001).

judge for a trial-type evidentiary hearing, if appropriate. If settlement discussions continue, the settlement judge shall file a report at least every sixty (60) days thereafter, informing the Commission and the Chief Judge of the parties' progress toward settlement.

(D) If the settlement judge procedures fail, and a trial-type evidentiary hearing is to be held, a presiding judge, to be designated by the Chief Judge, shall convene a conference in this proceeding to be held within approximately fifteen (15) days of the date the Chief Judge designates the presiding judge, in a hearing room of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426. Such conference shall be held for the purpose of establishing a procedural schedule. The presiding judge is authorized to establish procedural dates and to rule on all motions (except motions to dismiss), as provided in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

(E) The refund effective date established pursuant to Section 206(b) of the Federal Power Act is April 26, 2002.

(F) Motions to dismiss filed by Sunrise Power Company, LLC, Pacificorp Power Marketing, Inc., Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc., and Colton Power, L.P. are hereby denied for the reasons discussed in the body of this order.

(G) Pacificorp Power Marketing, Inc.'s motion to bifurcate is hereby denied for the reasons discussed in the body of this order.

(H) Sunrise Power Company's motion to establish a separate proceeding for the complaints against it and for consolidation is hereby denied for the reasons discussed in the body of this order.

Commissioner Massey dissented in part with a separate statement attached.

Commissioner Brownell concurred with a separate statement attached.

Appendix A

List of Contracts Set for Hearing

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-60-000

I. Contracts for which the issue of the applicable standard of review has been summarily decided

Seller's Name–Contract Date

Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company–2/21/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–3/23/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–4/20/2001

Soledad Energy, LLC–4/28/2001

GWF Energy, LLC–5/11/2001

Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP–5/22/2001

Coral Power, L.L.C.–5/24/2001

II. Contracts for which the issue of the applicable standard of review has been set for hearing

Seller's Name—Contract Date

El Paso Merchant, L.P.–2/13/2001

Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.–2/14/2001

Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.–3/2/2001

Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C.–3/13/2001

Alliance Colton, LLC–4/23/2001

Sempra Energy Resources–5/4/2001

PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P.–5/31/2001

California Electricity Oversight Board v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-62-000

I. Contracts for which the issue of the applicable standard of review has been summarily decided

Seller's Name–Contract Date

Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company–2/21/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–3/23/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–4/20/2001

Soledad Energy, LLC–4/28/2001

GWF Energy, LLC–5/11/2001

Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP–5/22/2001

Coral Power, L.L.C. –5/24/2001

II. Contracts for Which the issue of the applicable standard of review has been set for hearing

Seller's Name–Contract Date

El Paso Merchant, L.P.–2/13/2001

Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.–2/14/2001

Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.–3/2/2001

Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C.–3/13/2001

Alliance Colton, LLC–4/23/2001

Sempra Energy Resources–5/4/2001

PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P. –5/31/2001

Appendix B

List of Respondents

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC

Calpeak Project Companies

Calpine Energy Services, L.P.

Clearwood Electric Company, LLC

Colton Power, L.P.

Constellation Power Source, Inc.

Coral Power, L.L.C.

Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.

El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P.

Fresno Cogeneration Partners, LP

GWF Energy LLC

High Desert Power Project, LLC

Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C.

Mirant America Energy Marketing, LP

Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.

PacifiCorp Power Marketing, Inc.

PG&E Energy Trading-Power, LP

Sempra Energy Resources

Soledad Energy, LLC

Sunrise Power Company, LLC

Wellhead Power Gates LLC

Wellhead Power Panoche LLC

Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company

Appendix C

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources, et al.

Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and Docket No. EL02-62-000

Aquila Merchant Services, Inc.

BP Energy Company

California Independent System Operator, Inc.

California State Assembly*

Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California

City of Burbank, California

City of Santa Clara, California

Cogeneration Association of California and the Energy Producers and Users Coalition

Commonwealth Edison Company

Duke Energy North America, LLC and Duke Energy Trading & Marketing, LLC

Electric Power Supply Association*

---

* protest and/or comments

Exelon Corporation on behalf of Exelon Generation Company, LLC, PECO Energy Company, and Commonwealth Edison Company**

Independent Energy Producers Association*

Lassen Municipal Utility District

Modesto Irrigation District

Nevada Attorney General's Office, Bureau of Consumer Protection

Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company

Occidental Energy Ventures Corporation

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Portland General Electric Company

Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington

Reliant Energy Power Generation, Inc. and Reliant Energy Resources*

Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Southern California Edison Company

Southern California Water Company

Turlock Irrigation District

Universal Studios, Inc.

Western Power Trading Forum*

Wildflower Entities (Indigo Generation LLC, Larkspur Energy LLC, and Wildflower Energy, LP)*

** motion to intervene out-of-time

William L. MASSEY, Commissioner, *dissenting in part:*

This order establishes hearing procedures to develop a record upon which the Commission will decide whether to modify the terms of a series of long term contracts negotiated when the California spot markets were wildly out of control. Consistent with our policy regarding investigations under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act, the order establishes a refund effective date. And consistent with the our precedent, the order finds that a party that seeks to modify a contract bears a heavy burden. I agree with those basic decisions reached in this order. We need to give these contracts a good, hard look.

Yes, the complainants bear a heavy burden in demonstrating that the contracts should be modified, but the Federal Power Act says that any contract that is not just and reasonable is unlawful. I understand there is a concern that investigating these contracts may create uncertainty for long term contracting and investment. Nevertheless, this Commission is simply not meeting its statutory responsibilities if we rubber stamp contracts just because they are long term contracts. Any uncertainty in the market is caused by the Federal Power Act itself, not because we are setting these contracts for hearing.

There are, however, two aspects of today's order with which I disagree. First, I disagree with the order's conclusion that the complainants have not shown that the dysfunctional spot market had an adverse effect on the long term contract market. It seems obvious to me that the soaring prices in the spot market had a dramatic effect on both the negotiations and the contracts that were ultimately negotiated. Certainly no buyer would agree to pay $249 per Mwh if spot market prices, and expectations of future spot market prices, were not also in that range. The Commission

has recognized this relationship between spot market prices and long term contract prices.[1]

Second, I disagree with the order's erroneous conclusion that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which is not a party to any of the contracts at issue, is bound by the *Mobile-Sierra* language of the contracts. The reasoning seems to be that the entire California state government in some way functions as a monolith, making joint decisions on power procurement issues. Thus, under this flawed reasoning, a clause in the contracts signed by the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) somehow binds the CPUC.

Such a conclusion is unprecedented. The CPUC points out that it did not participate in the negotiations leading to the signing of these contracts. The CPUC is an independent regulatory body responsible for regulating utilities and charged with protecting consumers. It is thus similar to this Commission. This Commission would bristle at the idea that some executive branch official in the Department of the Interior, or even the Department of Energy, could bind us in some way that is inconsistent with our statutory responsibility. That would be unprecedented and wrong. What is the limit of this line or reasoning? Is any creature or institution of the California state government bound by the clauses in the CDWR contracts, even if they had no role in the negotiations?

The order does not cite any precedent for the conclusion binding the CPUC to the *Mobilie-Sierra* clauses in the contracts. And, I believe, it is because none exists. In fact, our precedents cut the other way. Our precedents generally support the position that a signatory to a contract cannot

---

[1] "... (m)aintaining an accurately priced spot market is the single most important element for disciplining longer term transactions." *AEP Power Marketing*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,219 (2001) at p. 61,972 (2001).

bind non-parties to a certain standard of review.[2] For example, less than one year ago we made the following statement in an order:

> *Mobile-Sierra* does not speak to situations such as this, where a non-party to the RAA (such as PJM, which is not a party to the RAA) seeks changes under Section 206. [fn 13 omitted] Under PPL's interpretation, parties to a contract who agree among themselves not to seek rate changes would be able to bind not only one another, but also other entities who are not parties to that contract (and did not receive the contractual benefits in exchange for which the parties traded away their right to seek rate changes). This result is not what the Supreme Court intended in *Mobile-Sierra*.[3]

For these reasons, I dissent in part from today's order.

Nora Mead BROWNELL, Commissioner, *concurring*:

I would like to extend the comments in my concurrence in *Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company v. Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C., et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,047 (2002), to these cases. First, I would like to note that in another context, I might have concluded that dismissal of the complaints was appropriate, given the lack of evidence offered. However, in this context, I have concluded that a greater airing of the evidence for and against modification of these contracts is more likely to resolve the controversy that plagues these markets. Second, I see nothing in the *Mobile-Sierra* case law that bars the Commission from ruling that a market-based

---

[2] *See*, for example, *Southern Company Services, Inc.*, 67 FERC ¶ 61,080 (1994) and *Florida Power & Light Company*, 67 FERC ¶ 61,141 (1994).

[3] *PJM Interconnection, LLC*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,206 at p. 16,878 (2001).

contract's silence on a buyer's rights to seek unilateral changes under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act triggers the public interest standard.[1] Moreover, I believe that such a ruling may be appropriate, as policy matter. However, I am comfortable deferring judgment on the standard to be applied to those contracts that do not contain explicit Section 206 waivers, pending a determination at hearing of whether there is any extrinsic evidence of the parties' intent.

For these reasons, I respectfully concur with this order.

---

[1] *See, e.g., Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1096 (D.C. Cir. 1998) ("The law is quite clear: absent contractual language susceptible to the construction that the rate may be altered while the contract subsists, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies."); *Boston Edison Co. v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60, 67 (1st Cir. 2000) ("[T]he specification of a rate or formula by itself implicates *Mobile-Sierra* (unless the parties negate the implication)."); and *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Public Service Company of New Mexico*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,233, at pp. 61,851-53 (2000) (buyer held to public interest standard notwithstanding contract's silence as to section 206 rights and evidence "that the parties did not ever discuss either Section 206 or the applicable standard of review were a Section 206 complaint to be filed.").

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

v.

Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,

Docket No. El02-60-001

California Electricity Oversight Board

v.

Sellers of Energy and Capacity Under Long-Term Contracts With the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-62-001 (Consolidated)

ORDER ON REHEARING

(Issued July 23, 2002)

100 FERC ¶ 61,098

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, Linda Breathitt, and Nora Mead Brownell.

1. This order addresses various requests for rehearing and clarification of an order issued on April 25, 2002 (April 25 Order)[1] setting for hearing complaints filed by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) and

[1] *Pub. Utilities Com'n of the State of California, et al. v. Sellers of Long-Term Contracts to the California Dep't of Water Resources, et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087 (2002), *reh'g pending* (April 25 Order).

the California Electricity Oversight Board (CEOB) against a group of sellers of energy under long-term bilateral contracts with the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR). In this order, we clarify that the complaints are dismissed as they relate to the contracts entered into after June 20, 2001, the date on which the Commission's West-wide mitigation went into effect.[2] We also grant requests for rehearing submitted by two qualifying facilities (QFs) and dismiss the complaints as they relate to those entities. We, however, deny other requests for rehearing and clarification.

2. This order reaffirms our decision in the April 25 Order to set CPUC's and CEOB's complaints for hearing. The evidentiary hearing established by the April 25 Order is in the public interest because it ensures that the customers have a full and fair opportunity to present their cases and that the Commission, in turn, has a complete record on which to base its ultimate decision.

Background

3. On April 25, 2002, the Commission issued an order addressing two almost identical complaints filed by the CPUC and CEOB against a group of sellers of energy under long-term bilateral contracts with the CDWR. The complaints alleged that the prices, terms, and conditions of such contracts are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest, and that the respondents obtained the prices, terms, and conditions in the contracts through the exercise of market power, in violation of the Federal Power Act (FPA).[3] The April 25 Order set those complaints for an evidentiary hearing, but held the hearing in abeyance pending the outcome of the settlement judge procedures. The Commission limited the scope of the hearing to the examination of the contracts that

---

[2] *See San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001).

[3] 16 U.S.C. §§ 796, *et seq.* (1994).

were entered into before June 20, 2001, the date on which the Commission's West-wide mitigation went into effect, since the effect of the West-wide mitigation was to stabilize prices.

4. In the April 25 Order, the Commission also held that the complainants must satisfy the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard[4] to justify modification of the contracts containing a specific contractual provision which addresses FPA Sections 205 and 206 rights of the parties to these contracts, as well as the Section 206 rights of third parties. As for the contracts that did not contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision, the Commission ruled that it did not have a sufficient record to address the *Mobile-Sierra* issue definitively and set for hearing the issue of whether the complainants must bear the burden of showing that a challenged contract is contrary to the public interest, or whether they would bear the burden of showing that the contract is not just and reasonable. The Commission also noted that even under a just and reasonable burden of proof standard, parties who seek to overturn market-based contracts into which they voluntarily entered would bear a heavy burden.

Respondents' and Interveners' Requests for Rehearing

5. Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC (Allegheny), El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. (El Paso), Sempra Energy Resources (Sempra), Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company (Williams) and GWF Energy LLC (GWF) argue that the Commission erred in not dismissing the CPUC's and CEOB's complaints on the ground that the complainants failed to establish a *prima facie* case. Allegheny also contends that the complaints constituted an impermissible attack on the Commission's prior orders encouraging market participants to move load

---

[4] *See United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) (Mobile); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956) (Sierra); and *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Div.*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958).

out of the spot market and enter into forward contracts and that the relationship between the spot market and forward market has been addressed by the Commission in its prior orders and investigations.

6. We disagree with these assertions. The April 25 Order found that the complainants established a *prima facie* case. The summary of the complainants' allegations, which is set forth in the April 25 Order at 61,377-78, is extensive and is adequate to support the Commission's initiation of a proceeding under Section 206 of the FPA[5] to determine whether the allegations are valid.[6] Therefore, we established an evidentiary hearing[7] to address the question of whether the dysfunctional California Independent System Operator (ISO) and California Power Exchange (PX) spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral contract prices so as to render them unjust and unreasonable or contrary to public interest. Contrary to Allegheny's contentions, this issue has not been examined by the Commission in its prior orders.

7. Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington (Snohomish), on the contrary, believes that the complainants have shown the nexus between the dysfunctional California spot markets and the forward bilateral contracts. We disagree. Prior to issuance of the April 25 Order, the Commission carefully examined all the materials on record and concluded that "[i]n the evidence presented thus far, the complainants have failed to show that the dysfunctional [ISO] and [PX] spot markets had an

---

[5] 16 U.S.C. § 824e (1994).

[6] *See, generally, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company*, 37 FERC ¶ 61,199, at p. 61,479 (1986).

[7] We note that the decision as to whether to conduct an evidentiary hearing is in the Commission's discretion. *See, e.g., Woolen Mill Associates v. FERC*, 917 F.2d 589, 592 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (*citing Cerro Wire & Cable Co. v. FERC*, 677 F.2d 124, 128 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

adverse effect on the long-term, bilateral markets in California."[8]

8. Williams, El Paso, and Allegheny argue that by setting the complaints for hearing, the Commission violated established legal precedent in favor of upholding the sanctity of contracts and also disregarded other important factors militating against reformation of the contracts in question. In particular, they state that the Commission has failed to consider that the prices in the CDWR contracts were within the Commission prescribed benchmark,[9] and that the complainants made no showing of market power abuse, which, in Williams', El Paso's, and Allegheny's opinion, is necessary to justify contract modification. Furthermore, Williams contends that the Commission disregarded the extreme hardships that suppliers may suffer should their contracts be abrogated or reformed.

9. In the April 25 Order, we recognized the Commission's long-standing policy to uphold the sanctity of contracts and stated that the Commission would not modify market-based contracts absent extraordinary circumstances. However, we found that based on the unusual circumstances presented, it was appropriate to set the complaints for hearing, to ensure that the complainants have a full and fair opportunity to present their cases and that the Commission, in turn, has a complete record on which to base its ultimate decision. We also provided the parties with an opportunity to present a wide range of facts and data in support of their cases, including those pertaining to negotiations of contract terms and the availability of other alternatives to both buyers and sellers, as well as the relation of the contract rates to the Commission's previously

---

[8] *See* April 25 Order at p. 61,383.

[9] *See San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at pp. 61,994-95 (2000), *reh'g denied*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,275, at p. 62,229 (2001) (setting a benchmark for five-year contracts for supply around-the-clock at $ 74/MWh).

identified benchmark for long-term bilateral contracts.[10] Regarding the contention that a showing of market power abuse is necessary to justify contract modification, the April 25 Order addressed this issue. We made it clear that the instant contracts were set for hearing based on the arguments that the dysfunctional spot markets in California adversely affected forward bilateral markets.

10. We also note that the April 25 Order did not address the merits of the complaints; it set the complaints for hearing and directed the presiding judge to consider evidence on a wide variety of topics. The outcome of that hearing, as well as the Commission's final decision cannot be predicted at this point. Thus, we believe that the parties requesting rehearing cannot claim at this time that they will not be able to obtain all the relief that they seek in these proceedings.

11. Allegheny, GWF, Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP (Mirant), Sempra, and El Paso further argue that the Commission should have ruled as a matter of law that the complainants must satisfy the public interest standard with regard to all of the contracts set for hearing, which should have led to dismissal of the complaints for failure to meet this standard of review. Mirant and Sempra add that in accordance with court precedent,[11] the public interest standard is also applicable to the CDWR contracts, which are silent as to the reservation of section 206 rights. Sempra further states that the Commission should have found that its contract with CDWR contains an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* clause.[12] Snohomish, on the contrary, argues

---

10 *See* April 25 Order at p. 61,384.

11 *Mirant* cites to *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light*, Gas and Water Div., 358 U.S. 103 (1958).

12 Sempra refers to Section 10.3 of the agreement which states: "The Parties acknowledge that: (i) this Agreement provides for wholesale power sales subject to the jurisdiction of the FERC under the FPA; and (ii) the rates, terms and conditions of this Agreement are "just" and "reasonable" within the meaning of the FPA and that changes in market

that the Commission should have applied the just and reasonable standard of review to all of the contracts.

12. We find that these contentions are without merit. The Commission needed additional information in order to determine the applicable standard of review for contracts that did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language. The evidentiary hearing was established to, among other things, interpret the terms of such contracts and to ascertain the intent of the parties at the time these contracts were signed. As we have previously observed, contract interpretation is often a complex process, involving the scrutiny of the contract itself, related documents, and at times parol or extrinsic evidence. We have explained that, where the contract at issue contains ambiguous language, it is appropriate for us to consider extrinsic evidence.[13] With respect to the contracts that appeared to have a specific contractual provision which addresses FPA Sections 205 and 206 rights of the parties, the Commission explicitly ruled that the complainants must satisfy the public interest standard to justify contract modification. We, however, were not persuaded that the Sempra contract was explicit with regard to the parties' Section 206 rights. Sempra will have an opportunity to present additional evidence to support its interpretation of the contract language at the hearing.

13. El Paso further argues that the Commission erred in prescribing a "laundry list" of factual considerations to be taken into account without providing any guidance to the parties and the presiding judge as to how these evidentiary requirements relate to the applicable legal standard. Snohomish, on the contrary, argues that the complainants

---

conditions will not render such rates, terms and conditions "unjust" or "unreasonable" for purposes of Section 206 of the FPA."

13 *See Oglethorpe Power Corporation v. Georgia Power Company*, 69 FERC ¶ 61,208, at 61,825 (1994), *order on reh'g*, 72 FERC ¶ 61,065 (1995); *Delmarva Power & Light Company*, 69 FERC ¶ 61,144, at 61,525-26 (1994).

should be afforded an opportunity to present additional evidence not identified in the April 25 Order. Snohomish also believes that the evidentiary factors listed in the April 25 Order unjustifiably focus on the buyer's actions rather than the sellers' actions and that this focus "blames the victim."

14. Contrary to El Paso's assertions, the instructions to the presiding judge in the April 25 Order are specific and will assist the judge in focusing on the main issue that the hearing is intended to resolve, *i.e.*, whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted. However, the list of evidentiary requirements is not exclusive. The parties are free to offer other evidence deemed by the presiding judge to be relevant to the Commission-prescribed scope of the hearing. We also believe that the April 25 Order's evidentiary requirements are applicable to both the sellers and the buyer and are not biased toward the complainants.

15. GWF argues that CPUC's and CEOB's complaints against it are barred by the doctrine of *res judicata* and the Commission's long-standing policy against relitigating matters that are already decided.[14] GWF explains that the contract at issue has been previously filed with and accepted by the Commission, despite the objections by CPUC and CEOB.[15] Subsequently, the Commission rejected CPUC's requests for rehearing of the December 19 Order, stating that "if the California Commission believes that the facts warrant Commission action, the California Commission should file a complaint bringing those facts to our attention and challenging the reasonableness of the underlying

---

[14] GWF *cites Panhandle E. Pipe Line Co.*, 38 FERC ¶ 63,030, at p. 65,201 (1987) (citing *Delmarva Power & Light Co.*, 14 FERC ¶ 63,074 (1981)).

[15] *See GWF Energy LLC*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,297 (2001), *reh'g denied* 98 FERC ¶ 61,330 (2002) (December 19 Order).

market-based rate authority."[16] GWF concludes that the Commission has already determined that the GWF contract is just and reasonable and thus this issue may not be relitigated in accordance with the doctrine of *res judicata*.

16. We disagree that the Commission has determined the justness and reasonableness of the GWF contract. The GWF contract was accepted by the Commission as an informational filing. In the December 19 Order, we emphasized that informational filings were not traditional FPA Section 205 filings and that we were not required to find that the agreements submitted for filing were just and reasonable, since we had already authorized the sellers to make sales at market-based rates. We also noted that the filing of such agreements does not serve as a vehicle to challenge the justness and reasonableness of either the agreements themselves or the underlying market-based rate authority.[17] Moreover, the issue set for hearing by the April 25 Order is whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted. In that order, we also stated that "[t]he hearing will not address issues concerning the Commission's policies on ... regulation of sellers with [market-based rate] authority."[18]

17. In addition, El Paso argues that while the Commission acknowledged certain requests submitted by El Paso in its answer to the complaints, the Commission never addressed them. In particular, El Paso requested that if the Commission instituted a FPA Section 206 investigation, it establish a refund effective date at the latest time permitted by law. El Paso explained that if it were to file ripple complaints, the refund effective date for those complaints

---

16 *See GWF Energy LLC*, 98 FERC ¶ 61,330, at p. 62,391 (2002) (March 27 Order).

17 *See* December 19 Order at pp. 62,390-91.

18 *See* April 25 Order at p. 61,384.

could be no sooner than mid-June, leaving El Paso with close to two months of refund exposure without potential offset from its own suppliers.

18. As we stated in the related order addressing similar complaints filed by Nevada Power Company, pursuant to Section 206(b) of the FPA, the Commission can establish a refund effective date only when it institutes a proceeding upon a complaint or its own motion. We cannot set refund effective dates for possible future complaints.[19] We note that El Paso has not, to date, filed a complaint.

19. Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C. and Primary Power International (collectively, IVRRC) and Soledad Energy LLC (Soledad) request rehearing of the April 25 Order on the grounds that IVRRC and Soledad are QFs and their contracts with CDWR are exempt from the reach of section 206 of the FPA.[20] Unfortunately, neither IVRRC nor Soledad informed the Commission of its QF status prior to the issuance of the April 25 Order.[21] We grant IVRRC's and Soledad's requests for rehearing. CPUC's and CEOB's complaints are hereby dismissed as they relate to IVRRC and Soledad.

Complainants' Requests for Rehearing

20. CEOB and CPUC argue that the Commission erred in excluding from hearing contracts that were entered into after June 20, 2001, the effective date for the West-wide mitigation. They explain that those contracts were only signed after June 20, 2001, while the terms were negotiated before the Commission imposed the West-wide mitigation designed to stabilize prices. CEOB and CPUC assert that

---

19 *Nevada Power Co. and Sierra Pacific Power Co. v. Duke Energy Trading and Mktg, L.P., et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,047, at p. 61,192 (2002), *reh'g pending.*

20 *See* 16 U.S.C. § 824a-3(e)(1)(1994) and 18 C.F.R. § 292.601(c) (2002).

21 *See Soledad Energy Partnership*, 47 FERC ¶ 62,125 (1989) and *Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Association, L.P.*, 45 FERC ¶ 62,184 (1988).

an option of renegotiating the contracts term after June 20, 2001 was not available to CDWR because it signed letters of intent and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and was bound to continue the negotiations in good faith to finalize the agreements. Moreover, CEOB and CPUC state that if CDWR had attempted renegotiations, it would have run a risk of missing delivery dates set for late August and September. In regard to the contract with Sunrise, CEOB and CPUC state that the pricing terms in the MOU for the Sunrise Project were not subject to renegotiation, but could only be withdrawn and reopened for discussion if the MOU is terminated. CEOB states that CDWR was in no position to postpone execution of the agreement with Sunrise until after the December 31, 2001, the termination date of the MOU, because it would have prevented the Sunrise Project from being put in service by August 15, 2001 and could have resulted in penalties being assessed against CDWR.

21. We do not find CEOB's and CPUC's arguments persuasive. Letters of intent and MOUs are used for the purpose of providing direction for the negotiation process and are not the equivalent of signed contracts. CDWR could have postponed execution of the contracts and demanded renegotiation of contract terms after it learned of the Commission-directed implementation of the West-wide mitigation. We recognize that CDWR might have had certain concerns regarding the possibility of renegotiating the proposed terms and conditions. These concerns, however, were not made known to us prior to the time the April 25 Order was issued.[22] We will not consider new

---

[22] In their replies to answers to the complaints as permitted by the April 25 Order, CPUC and CEOB did mention that the negotiation of all of the contracts took place prior to June 20, 2001. CPUC and CEOB, however, failed to state the possible implications of not following through with signing of these contracts. *See* Answer of the CPUC to Motions to Dismiss and for Other Forms of Affirmative Relief, and Motion for Leave to Submit This Answer to Protests and Answers, Docket No. EL02-60-000, at 6 (April 15, 2002) and Response of the California Electricity Oversight Board to Answers Opposing and Motions to Dismiss Long-

evidence presented for the first time at the rehearing stage of Commission proceedings. The Commission has discretion to reject evidence that was available but not proffered for consideration at the time of the decision.[23]

22. CEOB and CPUC assert that the Commission erred in ruling that CEOB and CPUC "stepped into the shoes" of CDWR and thus are bound by the same standard of review as would apply to CDWR. CEOB and CPUC explain that pursuant to the doctrine of equitable estoppel, the contract terms restricting the parties' Section 205 and 206 rights do not apply to the State of California (which CEOB or CPUC represent), since it acts in its sovereign capacity in this proceeding.[24]

23. In the April 25 Order, we stated that:

> ... in the instant proceeding, CPUC and CEOB act in the same capacity as CDWR. Based on the fact that in negotiating and executing the contracts at issue, CDWR represented the State of California, CPUC and CEOB, which are also State representatives, "stepped into the shoes" of CDWR by bringing these complaints. Thus, the same standard of review applies to these complainants as would apply to a similar complaint filed by CDWR.[25]

CPUC and CEOB's argument is misplaced. The State of California entered into the contracts at issue through one of its many agents, CDWR. We do not believe that a different standard of review should apply because these contracts are now being challenged by other agents of the State of California, namely CEOB and CPUC. The Commission is

---

Term Contract Complaint, Docket No. EL02-62-000, at 18-19 (April 15, 2002).

23 *See, e.g., Philadelphia Electric Company*, 58 FERC ¶ 61,060, at p. 61,133(1992); *Arkansas Power & Light Company*, 52 FERC ¶ 61,029, at p. 61,156 (1990).

24 CEOB cites *Molton, Allen, and Williams v. Harris*, 613 F.2d 1176, 1179 (D.C. Cir. 1980).

25 April 25 Order at p. 61,383.

charged with administering the Federal Power Act and in performance of this duty, the Commission views the State of California, CDWR, CPUC, and CEOB as one and the same entity that, in this case, acted as a buyer in the energy markets.

24. CEOB also believes that by ruling that the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review applies to certain contracts, the Commission deprived the complainants of an opportunity to present evidence that the *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, much like other contract terms being challenged, resulted from an uncompetitive market and thus should not be enforceable. We disagree. Nothing prevents the complainants from making this argument before the presiding judge. The April 25 Order directs the judge to consider evidence on whether any non-price terms were adopted upon CDWR's request.

25. CEOB and CPUC also raise a number of arguments that have been examined by the Commission prior to issuing the April 25 Order. In particular, they argue that the Commission's prior findings in regard to interdependence of the spot and forward markets warranted the granting of the complaints. We disagree. In prior orders, the Commission did in fact recognize interdependence between the spot and forward markets, but it has never made the determination that the dysfunctions in the spot market rendered forward contract prices unjust and unreasonable. This question was set for hearing in the April 25 Order because we did not believe that we had sufficient evidence to decide this issue summarily.

26. CPUC also argues[26] that the Commission introduced a new standard of review when it characterized the burden of proof under the just and reasonable standard as a heavy one. CPUC also adds that the Commission created an additional standard of review when it found that the complainants must demonstrate the adverse effect of the

---

[26] Snohomish raises the same argument in its intervention as CPUC.

spot market dysfunctions was of a magnitude warranting modification of the contracts in question.

27. Contrary to CPUC's assertion, in the April 25 Order we did not introduce a new standard of review. Section 206 complaints can be reviewed only under either the just and reasonable standard or the public interest standard. By emphasizing that a complainant bears a heavy burden of proof and the adverse effect must be of sufficient magnitude, we stated the obvious that the sanctity of contracts is presumed and that the Commission will not lightly undo the terms of existing contracts regardless of the applicable standard of review.

Requests for Clarification

28. Several parties request that the Commission clarify that the complaints against them are dismissed, since their contracts with CDWR were entered into after June 20, 2001. These parties are Clearwood Electric Company, LLC. (Clearwood), Fresno Cogeneration Partners, LP, Wellhead Power Gates, LLC, and Wellhead Power Panoche LLC (collectively, Wellhead Companies), PacifiCorp Power Marketing, Inc.(PPM), and Sunrise Power Company, LLC (Sunrise). We grant these requests for clarification and clarify that CPUC's and CEOB's complaints are hereby dismissed with prejudice as they relate to Clearwood, Wellhead Companies, PPM, and Sunrise.

29. Mirant and Sempra requests that the Commission clarify that the Commission's finding that the CPUC and CEOB have standing to bring the complaints does not preclude the parties from arguing during the proceeding that the views of the CPUC and CEOB should be afforded less weight than the views of CDWR because CDWR to date continued to support the justness and reasonableness of each of the CDWR contracts.

30. Mirant's and Sempra's requests for clarification are granted. In the April 25 Order, we held that the same standard of review applies to CPUC's and CEOB's complaints as would apply to a similar complaint filed by CDWR. Thus, all arguments as well as any inconsistent

statements by the three state agencies can be considered at the hearing.

31. Sempra also requests that the Commission clarify that CDWR will be subject to discovery in this proceeding. Pursuant to Rule 504(b)(5) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure,[27] the presiding judge will rule on discovery issues.

Procedural Matters

32. On May 14, 2002, CPUC submitted an answer to requests for clarification filed by Clearwood, Wellhead Companies, Sunrise, and PPM. On June 11, 2002, Sunrise also filed a response to CPUC's and CEOB's requests for rehearing. Pursuant to Rule 713(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure,[28] the Commission will not permit answers to requests for rehearing. For this reason, we reject CPUC's and Sunrise's answers to the requests for rehearing and clarification.

The Commission orders:

(A) Request for rehearing and clarification filed by Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC; El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P.; Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company; Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington; GWF Energy LLC; Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; and the California Electricity Oversight Board are hereby denied, as discussed in the body of this order.

(B) Request for rehearing filed by Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C. and Primary Power International, and Soledad Energy LLC are hereby granted, as discussed in the body of this order.

(C) Requests for clarification filed by Clearwood Electric Company, LLC; Fresno Cogeneration Partners, LP; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP; Sempra Energy Resources; Wellhead Power Gates, LLC and Wellhead

---

27 18 C.F.R. § 385.504(b)(5) (2002).

28 18 C.F.R. § 385.713(d) (2002).

Power Panoche LLC; PacifiCorp Power Marketing, Inc.; and Sunrise Power Company, LLC are hereby granted, as discussed in the body of this order.

William L. MASSEY, Commissioner, *dissenting in part*:

This order largely denies rehearing of the Commission's April 25 Order setting for hearing two complaints filed by the Public Utility Commission of California (CPUC) and the California Energy Oversight Board (CEOB). The hearing will determine whether the Commission should modify the terms of a series of long term bilateral contracts negotiated by the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) during the time when the California spot markets were wildly out of control.

While I continue to support the decision to set these contracts for hearing, I write separately and dissent in part because I would have granted rehearing on two issues. First, I remain convinced that the April 25 Order erred in concluding that the CPUC and CEOB, which were not parties to the contracts at issue, "stepped into the shoes" of the CDWR and are thus bound by the same standard of review as would apply to CDWR. Today's order maintains the flawed reasoning that a relationship under agency law concepts may be imputed to all parts of the California state government. Thus, the order would deem a clause in the contracts signed by the CDWR to bind the CPUC and CEOB. As I said in my previous partial dissent to the April 25 Order, the Commission's precedents generally support the position that a signatory to a contract cannot bind non-parties to a certain standard of review.[1] Today's order does not persuade me to alter my views. Thus, I would have granted rehearing on this issue.

The second concern I have with today's order is that it refuses to consider important evidence in the CPUC and CEOB requests for rehearing. The Memorandum of

---

[1] *See*, for example, *Southern Company Services, Inc.*, 67 FERC ¶ 61,080 (1994) and *Florida Power & Light Company*, 67 FERC ¶ 61,141 (1994).

Understanding (MOU) governing Edison International's Sunrise Project was executed prior to June 20, 2001 and set in place all of the essential elements for the purchase of power, including price terms. On rehearing, the CPUC and CEOB assert that the CDWR was legally obligated to proceed under the price terms already established in the MOU. The pricing terms could only be withdrawn and renegotiated if the MOU terminated. If CDWR had reneged on the MOU, it would have jeopardized the completion of this important generation project, slated for an in-service date of August 15, 2001, and could have resulted in penalties being assessed against CDWR.

Today's order concedes that the Commission has discretion to consider this new evidence. Nevertheless, the Commission rejects the evidence because it was available but not proffered prior to the issuance of the April 25 Order. It appears reasonable to me that this evidence was not proffered until rehearing because the CPUC and CEOB may not have anticipated that the Commission would exclude contracts finalized after June 20, 2001. CPUC and CEOB argue that to exclude the MOU from consideration under the terms of the April 25 Order elevates form over substance. I agree, and I would have granted rehearing on this point. The hearing process should sort through all of the evidence related to the negotiation of this MOU, including whether it was binding prior to the June 20, 2001 cutoff date.

For these reasons, I dissent in part from today's order.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California
v.
Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources,

Docket No. EL02-60-003

California Electricity Oversight Board
v.
Sellers of Energy and Capacity Under Long-Term Contracts with the California Department of Water Resources

Docket No. EL02-62-003 (Consolidated)

PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION ON THE ISSUE OF THE APPLICABLE STANDARD OF REVIEW

(Issued January 16, 2003)

102 FERC ¶ 63,013

Introduction

1. By Order dated January 10, 2003 (*January 10 Order*),[1] the Commission directed the undersigned presiding administrative law judge to determine the applicable standard of review for the contracts at issue in this consolidated proceeding not containing explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language, and as to the contracts for which the undersigned ALJ finds the applicable standard of review to

[1] *Public Utils. Comm'n of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 (2003). (January 10 Order).

be the "public interest" standard, to certify the record directly to the Commission for consideration of all remaining issues in the case. In accordance with the Commission's January 10 Order, this is a partial initial decision limited to the single threshold issue of the applicable standard of review for the subject contracts.

Background

2. Commission Trial Staff's Initial Brief, which has been filed with the Commission and served on all parties on the Restricted Service List, contains a good summary of the procedural history of this case and is adopted and incorporated herein in pertinent part.

3. On February 25, 2002, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) and the California Electricity Oversight Board (CEOB) (jointly referred to as "Complainants" or "the State) filed separate, but virtually identical, complaints seeking to modify over 30 contracts.[2] The contracts at issue are long-term contracts between the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) and numerous sellers[3] of energy. The Complainants claimed that the prices, terms and conditions of these contracts are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest. The Complainants also alleged that these sellers obtained the prices, terms, and conditions in the contracts through the exercise of market power in violation of the Federal Power Act (FPA), and the sellers' actions are causing injury to the citizens and ratepayers of California.

4. On April 25, 2002, (April 25 Order), the Commission issued an order dismissing the complaints as to contracts that were entered into after June 20, 2001, "the date on which the Commission's West-wide mitigation went into

---

[2] A list of the contracts which the Complainants sought to modify is contained in Appendix A to the April 25, 2002 Order.

[3] A list of the sellers is contained in Appendix B to the April 25, 2002 Order.

effect,... since the effect of the West-wide mitigation was to stabilize prices," but setting the complaints for hearing as to those contracts entered into before June 20, 2001.[4] As to those contracts, the Commission established an evidentiary hearing to address:

> whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted. The hearing will not address issues concerning the Commission's policies on granting market-based rate authority or on regulation of sellers with such authority. Further, if the judge concludes that modification of one or more of the contracts is warranted, the judge should not attempt at this stage to determine how those contracts should be modified.

99 FERC at p. 61,384 (footnote omitted).

5. Furthermore, the Commission specifically limited the scope of the evidentiary hearing to matters other than market manipulation and the exercise of market power by noting that it had previously issued an order on February 13, 2002, directing a full staff investigation of potential manipulation of electric and natural gas prices in the West. In explaining the difference in the two proceedings, the Commission stated:

> We are setting the instant contracts for hearing under section 206 of the FPA based on the arguments that the dysfunctional spot markets in California caused long-term contracts not to be reasonable, whereas the investigation is looking at whether there was improper behavior by sellers that may have caused prices not to be reasonable.

Id. at p. 61,383, n.28.

6. Following the Chief Judge's Order dated September 6, 2002, designating the undersigned as the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in this proceeding and

---

[4] *See* April 25, 2002 Order.

establishing hearing procedures, the undersigned ALJ convened a number of pre-hearing conferences to address discovery disputes, motions to strike, and related issues regarding the scope of the evidentiary hearing, consistently ruling that , based on the Commission's Orders, the issue of alleged exercise of market power was not within the scope of the issues set for hearing in this proceeding. Tr. at 207:7-10. These rulings were further clarified during a pre-hearing conference held on November 19, 2002, reflecting the view of the undersigned ALJ that, by excluding the issue of alleged exercise of market power in the instant proceedings, the Commission sought to provide the State with an opportunity for expedited review of the subject contracts based on the less arduous showing that the dysfunctional spot markets in California caused long-term contracts not to be reasonable; that is, to pursue their complaint allegations without the added burden of having to prove allegations of exercise of market power as the basis for seeking modification of the subject contracts. Tr. at 547:7-551:17.

7. In point of fact, on November 20, 2002, the Commission issued an order allowing the State to conduct discovery into market manipulation by various sellers during the Western power crises of 2000 and 2001.[5] In the view of the undersigned ALJ, this Order underscored the need to limit the scope of the subject proceedings to that proscribed by the Commission to ensure that this expedited proceeding would not interfere with the ongoing Staff investigation in Docket No. PA02-2-000. Accordingly, this point was reiterated on the record the first day of the hearing, which commenced on December 2, 2002, as follows:

> JUDGE: "I, for the life of me, cannot understand why the state insists on trying to create a burden for itself

---

[5] *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services into Markets Operated by the California Independent System Operator Corp. and the California Power Exchange*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,186 (2002) (November 20 Order).

that it does not have in this case. The state does not have to prove that there has been the exercise of market power to establish the threshold issue of whether the dysfunctional California spot market adversely impacted long-term bilateral markets. I do not know why the state continues to try at every turn to insinuate into this hearing exercise of market power issues when the Commission has specifically proscribed that area with respect to this proceeding. The state is well aware that there is a full investigation ongoing that is going to address that specific issue. Tr. at 797: lines 4-16.

8. Nevertheless, the parties were permitted to have any evidence excluded from the record as a result of these rulings considered by the Commission as an offer of proof. Further, in accordance with the Commission's April 25 Order, the parties were provided with an opportunity to present a wide range of facts and data in support of their cases, including evidence pertaining to negotiations of contract terms and the availability of other alternatives to both buyers and sellers, as well as the relation of the contract rates to the Commission's previously identified benchmark for long-term bilateral contracts. *Id.* at p. 61,384.

9. In addressing the standard of review to be applied to the contracts at issue given the extraordinary remedy of contract modification sought by the Complainants, the Commission reiterated its long-standing policy of upholding the sanctity of contracts and stated that it would not modify market-based contracts absent extraordinary circumstances. 99 FERC at p. 61,383. The Commission then made an initial determination that for certain contracts that contained explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language, the Complainants would have to satisfy the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard[6] to justify modification of the contracts. 99 FERC

---

[6] *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) (*Mobile*); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956) (*Sierra*).

at o, 61,383. The parties whose contracts contained the explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language included: Allegheny Energy Supply Company, L.L.C. (Allegheny); Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, L.P. (Mirant); and Coral Power, L.L.C. (Coral).[7]

10. For the contracts that did not contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision, the Commission ruled that it needed additional information in order to determine the applicable standard of review for these contracts. *Id.* The sellers whose contracts did not contain explicit Mobile-Sierra language included: El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. (EPME); Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc. (Dynegy); Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc. (MSCG); and Sempra Energy Resources (Sempra).[8]

11. On July 23, 2002, (July 23 Order), the Commission issued its Order on Rehearing, reaffirming its decision to dismiss the complaints related to contracts entered into after June 20, 2001, granting rehearing and dismissing complaints as to two qualifying facilities, and denying all

---

[7] Other contracts in this category included: Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company (Williams); Soledad Energy, LLC (Soledad); and GWF Energy, L.L.C. (GWF). These contracts are no longer at issue in this proceeding because the parties have reached a settlement and the complaints against these parties have been withdrawn. Notice of withdrawal regarding the Soledad contract was filed on July 12, 2002, and a notice of withdrawal regarding the GWF contract was filed on September 4, 2002. By Order of the Chief Judge dated November 26, 2002, the proceeding as to Williams was suspended pending finalization of the parties' settlement agreement.

[8] Other contracts in this category included: Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C. (Imperial Valley) whose contract was dismissed in the Commission's Order on Rehearing (100 FERC ¶ 61,098, at P 19); Alliance Colton, L.L.C. (Alliance Colton); and PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P. (PG&E Energy Trading). Notices of withdrawal of the complaint as to Alliance Colton and PG&E Energy Trading were filed on September 30, 2002 and October 3, 2002, respectively.

other requests for rehearing and clarification.[9] In this Order, the Commission reiterated its position that it needed additional information in order to determine the applicable standard of review for contracts that did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language. According to the Commission, "[t]he evidentiary hearing was established to, among other things, interpret the terms of the contracts at issue and to ascertain the intent of the parties at the time the contracts were signed." 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 at P 12.

12. The parties simultaneously filed their direct testimony and exhibits on October 17, 2002. The Staff filed its direct testimony and exhibits on November 8, 2002, and the parties filed their rebuttal testimony and exhibits on November 14, 2002. Pre-hearing Briefs were filed on November 25, 2002. The hearing began on December 2, 2002 and concluded on December 12, 2002.

13. On October 29, 2002, Allegheny filed an emergency motion for summary dismissal of the State's complaints as to its contracts. By Order dated December 17, 2002 (December 17 Order) the Commission denied Allegheny's emergency motion; however, to expedite resolution of the proceeding as to Allegheny and other parties whose contracts contained explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, the Commission directed the undersigned ALJ to omit the initial decision on this issue, and certify the record directly to the Commission.[10] In accordance with the Commission's December 17 Order, on December 24, 2002, the undersigned ALJ certified the record for this proceeding directly to the Commission as to Allegheny, Coral, and Mirant and proceeded to evaluate the record for the purpose of

---

[9] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, et al., v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts, et al.*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 (2002) (July 23 Order).

[10] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, et al., v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts, et al.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,293 (2002) (December 17 Order).

preparing an initial decision regarding the contracts for the remaining sellers.[11]

14. By motion filed on December 19, 2002, Dynegy, EPME and SER, and MSCG by motion filed on December 26, 2002, (together, Indicated Respondents or Sellers), moved for partial summary disposition on the standard of review applicable to their long-term contracts with the CDWR, (together, the Indicated Contracts).[12]

15. By Order dated January 10, 2003 (January 10 Order),[13] the Commission ruled on the subject motions by directing the undersigned ALJ to determine the applicable standard of review for the contracts not containing explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language, and as to the contracts for which the undersigned ALJ finds the applicable standard of review to be the "public interest" standard, to certify the record directly to the Commission for consideration of all remaining issues in the case.

Position of the Parties and Staff

16. In their joint Prehearing Brief submitted on November 25, 2002,[14] the Complainants attempted to argue that the "public interest" standard and the "just and reasonable" standard are indistinguishable for the purpose

---

[11] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, et al., v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts, et al.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,034 (2002). *See also* Errata Notices dated 12/31/02 and 1/10/03.

[12] Specifically, the Indicated Contracts are: (a) the Energy Purchase Agreement (the SER Agreement), dated May 4, 2001, by and between CDWR and SER, Exh. SER-2; (b) the February 13, 2001 Contract between EPME and CDWR (EPME Contract), Exh. EPME-29; (c) the System Contingent Capacity Purchase and Sale Agreement (the Dynegy Agreement), dated March 2, 2001, by and between CDWR and Dynegy, Exh. DYN-2, and (d) the February 14, 2001 Contract between MSCG and CDWR (MSCG Agreement), Exh. MSC-2.

[13] See *Public Utils. Comm'n of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 (2003). (January 10 Order).

[14] Trial Brief on Behalf of the California Electricity Oversight Board and the California Public Utilities Commission, Docket Nos. EL02-60, *et al.* (November 25, 2002).

of this proceeding. Complainants' Prehearing Brief at 44, 47-49. However, in the December 17 Order, the Commission rejected this position stating:

> The fact that a contract may be found to be unjust and unreasonable under sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act does not in and of itself demonstrate that the contract is contrary to the public interest under the Supreme Court cases. Accordingly, we instruct the parties to apply the correct legal standards in developing this case and making their arguments.[15]

17. Complainants further propound that the holdings in *Mobile* and *Sierra* precluded the sellers from seeking damages in contractually agreed upon prices for their own benefit, but left intact the paramount duty of the Commission to protect the public interest. *Id.* Complainants conclude that applying the "correct legal standard" under *Mobile-Sierra* thus requires the Commission to determine whether the challenged contracts adversely affect the public interest. I.B. at 16.

18. Further, Complainants attempt to distinguish between the "low" rates in Sierra and the "high" rates alleged in the instant case, and the fact that the "buyer" is a state agency purchasing power solely for the benefit of the public. *Id.* at 16-17. Thus, the State claims that under *Mobile-Sierra*, where the rates are borne directly by the public, the "just and reasonable" standard and the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard effectively merge, because it is contrary to the public interest to charge unlawful rates to the public. *Id.* at 19.

19. The joint position of the Indicated Respondents is that, like the sellers with explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language contained in their contracts, they too are protected under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine and may have their contracts modified "only if the public interest so requires." Respondents Joint I.B. at 7-8. Respondents cite extensive

---

15 *Id.* at 6.

precedent for the proposition that the law is clear that, absent contractual language preserving a parties' right to unilaterally seek a change in the contract, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies. *Id.* at 9-10. Respondents also cite the recent Nevada Power ID, where Judge Cintron found that fixed forward contracts were to be reviewed under the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard. *Id.* Respondents note that none of the subject contracts contain provisions for the State to seek unilateral changes to the contracts under section 206, and therefore argue that the public interest standard of review applies to these contracts. *Id.* at 11. Respondents also note that Staff Witness Natalie Tingle-Steward reviewed the challenged contracts and found that none of the contracts permit unilateral application to the Commission for rate changes. *Id.*

20. Respondents cite the unrebutted testimony of Respondents' witnesses who testified that in each contract, either the Seller or the State insisted on language that would ensure that either the State would not seek abrogation of the contract or that the Commission would be precluded from changing rates considered "just and reasonable." *Id.* at 11-12.

21. Further, the Respondents dispute the State's position that the public interest standard and the just and reasonable standard impose the same burden. *Id.* at 13. Respondents emphasize that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine protects the public at large rather than the direct benefit of the seller and purchaser, which applies the just and reasonable standard, and therefore it cannot be waived or eliminated by agreement of the parties. *Id.* Moreover, Respondents opine that applying the public interest standard of review is fully consistent with the statutory requirements of the Federal Power Act (FPA) because a contract with a mutually agreed-upon fixed rate satisfies the just and reasonable standard unless the challenging party can show that the public interest compels a contrary result. *Id.* at 14.

22. Intervenor, Universal Studios, took the position that the State has only the burden of showing, in the next phase of the case, that the contracts are not "just and reasonable." U.S. I.B. at 13. Universal Studios submits that a private contract no matter how valid, can never "trump" the FPA, which requires that all rates and charges be "just and reasonable." *Id.* Universal Studios cites the testimony of several Sellers' witnesses and Staff who concluded that the Commission has the power to review contracts to determine whether they are just and reasonable. *Id.* 15-16. Universal Studios concludes that no credible evidence supports a finding that the State, as surrogates for the consumers of California, have any higher burden than to show that the rates and charges under the Seller's contracts are not "just and reasonable." *Id.* at 16. Universal Studio argues that for market-based rates to be just and reasonable, they must be "within the same 'zone of reasonableness' as cost-based rates," *citing Farmers Union Cent. Exch. Inc. v. FERC*, 734 F.2d 1486, 1530 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied sub nom. Williams Pipe Line Company v. Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc.*, 469 U.S. 1034 (1984); and *San Diego Gas & Elec Co v. Sellers of Energy*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at p. 61,998 (2000), *order on reh'g*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 at p. 62,559 n.52 (2001). Exh. US-1 at 11:7-24.

23. Commission Trial Staff explains that where a contract fails to specifically provide that the contract may be altered, *Mobile-Sierra* requires that proposed changes meet the public interest standard. *Id.* at 14. Staff cites recent Commission findings that hold that the public interest standard applies to both buyer and seller, and that language restricting the seller's right to seek certain unilateral changes under Section 205 was an implicit waiver of the buyer's right to do so under Section 206. *Id.* at 16. Staff points out that the Commission has recently emphasized that it does not take contract modification lightly, which was also asserted in Commission Orders granting the hearings on both the Nevada Power and the instant dockets. *Id.*

24. Trial Staff disputes the Complainants' public/private distinction in the *Mobile-Sierra* line of cases, pointing out that even as recently as the December 17 Order, the Commission stated that just because a contract may be found to be unjust and unreasonable under the FPA, does not without more, demonstrate that the contract is contrary to the public interest. *Id.* at 19. Staff concludes that, after a review of each of the four remaining contracts and the record, the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard applies. *Id.* at 20.

Discussion and Findings

25. Commission Trial Staff's Initial Brief, which has been filed with the Commission and served on all parties on the Restricted Service List, contains an excellent summary of the case law and evolution of the Commission's policy regarding the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine and is adopted and incorporated herein in pertinent part.

1. *Applicable Case Law and Commission Precedent*

26. The Federal Power Act provides two methods for changing wholesale electric rates and related terms and conditions. Under Section 205, a utility may initiate rate changes by making a filing with the Commission. Under Section 206, any party (or the Commission on its own motion) may request a prospective change in an existing rate upon a finding by the Commission that the existing rate is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential.

27. The Federal Power Act, however, does not preclude utilities and their customers inter se from prescribing rates contractually. The interplay between the rights of parties to set rates among themselves and the Commission's power to change those rates was first examined in 1956 by the Supreme Court in separate decisions under the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act. In *Mobile*, a supplier of natural gas sought to unilaterally increase the rate of a contract filed with the Commission. The Supreme Court held that the Natural

Gas Act does not empower natural gas companies unilaterally to change their contracts. This Court went on to say that by "preserving the integrity of contracts, it permits the stability of supply arrangements which all agree is essential to the health of the natural gas industry... The contracts remain fully subject to the paramount power of the Commission to modify them when necessary in the public interest."[16] In *Sierra*, the Court extended to proceedings under the Federal Power Act its holding that fixed-price contracts could not be unilaterally modified. However, in light of the allegations that the contractual rate produced less than a fair return to the utility, the Court added that the Commission was empowered under Section 206 to modify a contract rate despite express provisions prohibiting such changes if it "is necessary in the public interest."[17] Two years later, the Court further delineated the relationship between the Commission's power to change rates and the parties' rights to set them contractually in *United Gas Pipe Line Co v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Div.*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958) (*Memphis*) making it clear that just as parties may enter into contracts which specifically contemplate unilateral rate change filings, as in *Memphis*, they may contractually eliminate the parties' right to make rate changes during the life of the contract.

28. Further, and perhaps more importantly for purposes of determining the applicable standard for the subject contracts, the case law is now clear that where a contract fails to specifically provide that the contract may be unilaterally altered, *Mobile-Sierra* requires that proposed changes meet the public interest standard. In *Texaco Inc v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1096 (D.C. Cir. 1998), the court held that notwithstanding the fact that the agreement was silent on the issue, the Commission was

---

16 *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956).

17 *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 348, 355 (1956).

precluded from ordering alterations of rate design for reasons other than the public interest. The court also clarified its position with respect to its prior ruling in *Papago*:

> The court [in *Papago*] did not suggest that the parties' failure to explicitly foreclose the Commission's authority to replace rates [under Section 206] would leave it intact. The law is quite clear: absent contractual language "susceptible to the construction that the rate maybe altered while the contract subsists," the Mobile-Sierra doctrine applies.

148 F.3d at 1096 (footnotes omitted).

29. More recently, in *Boston Edison Co v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60 (1st Cir. 2000), the court affirmed the position that, in the absence of clear contractual language allowing contract modifications under Section 206, the Commission is bound by the public interest standard:

> [T]he specification of a rate or formula by itself implicates *Mobile-Sierra* (unless the parties negate the implication) and that a generally framed boilerplate clause ... does not constitute such a negation.
>
> * * *
>
> ... FERC should stop trying to rewrite deals that the parties have already made under the aegis of *Mobile-Sierra* unless it properly makes the public interest standard .

Id. at 67 and 68 (footnotes omitted).

30. The Commission has also applied the same standard whether it's a buyer or a seller. For instance, in *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Public Service Company of New Mexico*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,233 (2000), the Commission held a buyer to the public interest standard, notwithstanding the fact that the contract was silent as to the buyer's Section 206 rights and "the evidence introduced at the hearing similarly reflected that the parties did not ever discuss either Section 206 or the applicable standard of review were a Section 206 complaint to be filed." 91 FERC at p. 61,852.

The Commission in essence interpreted the language in the contract as restricting the seller's right to seek certain unilateral rate changes under Section 205 as an implicit waiver of the buyer's right to do the same under Section 206. *Id.*

31. While it is important to recognize that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine arose in the context of a completely regulated environment, where, as here, the contracts were entered into under the parties' market-based rate authority, the Commission has stated that "[p]reservation of the contracts has, if anything, become even more critical." 99 FERC at p. 61,383.

2. *Mobile-Sierra "Public Interest" Standard Applies to these Contracts*

32. The Commission is, of course, already fully aware that under current case law where a contract fails to specifically provide that the contract may be unilaterally altered, *Mobile-Sierra* requires that proposed changes meet the public interest standard. As Commissioner Brownell noted in her concurring opinion setting this matter for hearing:

> I see nothing in the *Mobile-Sierra* case law that bars the Commission from ruling that a market-based contract's silence on a buyer's rights to seek unilateral changes under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act triggers the public interest standard.

99 FERC at p. 61,388.

33. Nevertheless, with respect to the contracts involving Dynegy, EPME, MSCG, and Sempra that did not contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision, the Commission established an evidentiary hearing to, among other things, "interpret the terms of the contracts at issue and to ascertain the intent of the parties at the time the contracts were signed." 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 at P 12. Accordingly, it is clear to the undersigned ALJ that the Commission is attempting to provide the State with every opportunity to establish through extrinsic evidence that the parties

intended a different standard to apply to the subject contracts.

34. The evidentiary record in this proceeding closed on December 12, 2002. The parties filed Initial Briefs on January 10, 2003. But the State just now acknowledges that it has not been able to justify the application of a different standard to the Indicated Contracts based on the absence of an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision in the remaining four contracts.[18] Nevertheless, as a convenience to the Commission, a summary of the evidence of record on this issue may still be helpful.

35. The evidence of record proffered by the contracting parties regarding intent of the parties as it pertains to unilateral filing rights under the subject Indicated Contracts, other than the express language of the Indicated Contracts themselves, has been summarized by the Sellers in their January 10, 2003 Joint Initial Brief as follows: Exh. SER-1 at 34:6-36:14 (Niggli); Exh. SER-32 at 6:17-7:5 (Niggli); Exh. SER-34; Exh. SER-35; Exh. SER-55; Exh. SER-56; Exh. DYN-1 at 12:10-12, 26:15-18, 31:23-32:24, 33:10-34:5 (Lednicky); Exh. DYN-40 at 16:3-6 (Lednicky); Exh. MSC-1 at 9:12-18 (Hamdan); Exh. S-1 at 6:15-8:17, 11:1-11, 15:12-19:2 (Forman); Exh. S-4 at 6:11-15:14 (Tingle-Stewart); Exh. CAL-181 at 308:12-25 (Freeman); Tr. at 1633:8-1637:6 (Hart); Tr. at 2292:16-2293:6 (Smith); Tr. at 2476:5-2482:6 (Forman); Tr. at 2486:8-21 (Forman). In addition to the contracting parties, Sellers note that intervenor Universal Studios submitted testimony on Universal's understanding of its rights regarding this issue, Exh. US-1 at 13:3-14:16 (Thomas), and sought to elicit testimony on cross-examination of certain witnesses for the Sellers and the Staff as to whether they thought the contracts authorized sellers to charge unreasonable rates under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, see, *e.g.*, Tr. at

---

[18] January 14, 2003, Answer of California Public Utilities Commission and California Electricity Oversight Board to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance.

2143:13-2149:11 (Lednicky); Tr. at 2293:8-15 (Smith); Tr. at 2458:4-7 (Forman).

36. A complete discussion of the cited evidence of record is also provided by the Sellers in their Joint Initial Brief, but will not be repeated here. However, Commission Trial Staff's analysis of each of the four remaining contracts considered in the context of this record evidence provides a useful framework for the Commission's consideration of the issue of the applicable standard of review and is therefore adopted and incorporated herein as follows:

a. *Dynegy Contract*

37. The Dynegy contract with CDWR, dated March 2, 2001, was established pursuant to the Edison Electric Institute Master Power Purchase and Sale Agreement (EEI Master Agreement),[19] and filed with the Commission on November 21, 2001 in Docket No. ER01-1718-000. Exh. CAL-32. It was accepted for filing on January 18, 2002. Exh. S-4 at 10:16-19. There is no provision in this contract which specifically addresses the parties' sections 205 and 206 rights. However, Section 8, Paragraph F of the System Contingent Capacity Purchase and Sales Agreement, which is a subpart of the contract, appears to limit CDWR's right to take any action which is inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of the rates:

> CDWR acknowledges and agrees that all payments to [Dynegy] hereunder, ... are "just and reasonable" within the meaning of section 451 of the Public Utilities Code and that CDWR shall not take any action or fail to take

---

19 As Staff witness Ms. Tingle-Stewart explains, the EEI Master Agreement is a standardized agreement developed by Edison Electric Institute and the National Energy Markets Association. It generally consists of a form agreement, a cover sheet and a confirmation letter. The cover sheet is often used by parties to elect certain options and to modify the terms of the form agreement if so desired. The *Pro Forma* EEI Master Agreement is not filed with the Commission. The Commission has accepted for filing a *Pro Forma* short-form market-based tariff and umbrella service agreement, which is intended to be used in conjunction with the EEI Master Agreement. Exh. S-4 at 5:18-6:4.

> any action which is inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of such payments.

Exh. DYN-2 at EOB-DYN-1-0005286. Mr. Lednicky explains that given the statutory scheme and the CDWR funding mechanism established by the emergency California Assembly Bill (AB 1X),[20] Dynegy insisted on this provision, otherwise Dynegy would not have had any assurance of payment and no assurance that CDWR would not later seek to devise a way to abrogate the contract. Exh. DYN-1 at 33:6-9. He also states that Section 8.F was not intended to allow CDWR to seek relief from the Commission to reform or abrogate the contract under Section 206 of the FPA under a just and reasonable standard of review. Exh. DYN-1 at 33:15-34:5. According to Mr. Lednicky:

> It seems clear to me that any argument advanced by, or on behalf of CDWR, that the FERC can or should review and determine whether the Agreement, or payments under the Agreement are "just and reasonable" is the taking of an action "inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of the payments" and is expressly prohibited by the Agreement. *Id.*

38. While this Commission's determination regarding whether a rate is just and reasonable is not governed by Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code, this provision does suggest that the parties agreed that they would not take any action which is inconsistent with the presumed just and reasonable nature of the rates in this contract. Accordingly, and because the contract is otherwise silent with respect to the parties' sections 205 and 206 rights, as Ms. Tingle-Stewart explains, the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard should be applied in this instance. Exh. S-4 at 10:15-12:10.

b. *EPME Contract*

39. The EPME contract with CDWR was established pursuant to the EEI Master Agreement and entered into on

---

20 Exh. CAL-15.

February 13, 2001. Exh. CAL-34. The contract states that the rates, terms and conditions are provided in accordance with the general terms and conditions under EPME's market-based rate authority—FERC Rate Schedule 1. No evidence was presented regarding whether and to what extent the parties discussed either limiting or preserving their rights to make unilateral changes to the rates, terms or conditions of the contract. Absent specific language to the contrary and considering Commission precedent in favor of protecting the integrity of contracts, Ms. Tingle-Stewart concluded that the Mobile-Sierra "public interest" standard applies. Exh. S-4 at 10:1-14.

c. *MSCG Contract*

40. The MSCG contract was also established pursuant to the EEI Master Agreement. It was entered into on February 14, 2001. Exh. MSC-2. The contract is similarly silent as to the parties' rights to make unilateral changes in the rates, terms or conditions of service. According to Mr. Hamdan, "CDWR never requested that it be permitted to reserve its right to request unilateral changes to the contract by filing a Section 206 Complaint at FERC." Exh. MSC-1 at 9:16-18. It is not clear why MSCG did not insist on specific language that limited the parties' unilateral rights to make a change in the rates, given that MSCG in negotiating with Public Utility District No. 1 Snohomish County, Washington approximately three weeks before insisted on inserting specific language that the rates were not subject to change through a filing pursuant to either sections 205 or 206 of the FPA. Exh. S-4 at 8:7-15. However, given that the contract is silent as to limitations on the parties' rights to seek a unilateral change, and no evidence was presented that even suggested that the parties discussed this matter much less concluded that the just and reasonable standard should apply when a party seeks to make a change, Ms. Tingle-Stewart concluded that the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard must be applied, consistent with precedent. Exh. S-4 at 7:17-9:18.

d. *Sempra Contract*

41. The Sempra contract was executed on May 4, 2001. Exh. SER-2. It consists of an Enabling Agreement (which was filed with the Commission),[21] and an accompanying Energy Purchase Agreement (which was not filed with the Commission). The Enabling Agreement is a short, two-page document that refers to the Energy Purchase Agreement for specificity regarding the rates, terms and conditions of service. The only provision which addresses either party's rights under Sections 205 and 206 is Section 10.03 of the Energy Purchase Agreement. It provides:

> FERC. The Parties acknowledge that (i) this agreement provides for wholesale power sales subject to the jurisdiction of the FERC under the FPA; and (ii) the rates, terms and conditions of this Agreement are "just" and "reasonable" within the meaning of the FPA and that changes in market conditions will not render such rates, terms and conditions "unjust" or "unreasonable" for purposes of Section 206 of the FPA. *Id.*

42. As the specific language of the contract reflects, if the only problem with the rates, terms and conditions in the contract is due to changes in market conditions, then there is no basis for either party to complain that the rates, terms and conditions in the contract are no longer just and reasonable. Exh. S-1 at 15:10-14. As explained more fully by Sempra Witness Michael Niggli with regard to the intent of the parties here, initially Sempra proposed contract language that would give both CDWR and Sempra the unilateral right to seek modification. But because of CDWR's negative reaction to the idea that FERC would have the ability to review the rates, terms and conditions of the contract, they agreed to modify the contract to limit the unilateral right of either Sempra or CDWR to modify the

---

21 The Enabling Agreement was filed with the Commission on June 28, 2001 under Sempra's market-based rate schedule in Docket No. ER01-2443-000. The Enabling Agreement was accepted for filing on August 2, 2001.

rates, terms or conditions of service. Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26. Based on the specific language in Section 10.03 of Sempra's Energy Purchase Agreement and the testimony of Sempra's witness, Ms. Tingle-Stewart concluded that the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard applies to this contract as well. Exh. S-4 at 15:14.

43. Based on the specific language of the subject contracts and the evidence of record proffered in this proceeding as discussed *supra*, it is the determination of the undersigned ALJ that the Sellers and Staff have submitted persuasive testimony and probative supporting exhibits demonstrating that the remaining contracts between CDWR and Dynegy, EPME, MSCG and SER are subject to review under the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard. That evidence demonstrates that the contracting parties did not intend to preserve their rights to make unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, terms or conditions of the Indicated Contracts. *See, e.g.*, Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26 (Niggli); Exh. DYN-1 at 33:10-34:5 (Lednicky). Rather, the extrinsic evidence of record indicates that the State had very little confidence in the Commission as an avenue for relief at the time these contracts were negotiated, that CDWR negotiated the subject contracts in a "crisis" environment, and that for various reasons CDWR's negotiating team focused almost exclusively on the pricing terms of the subject contracts. In fact, at least one witness testified that precluding unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, terms and conditions was an issue of importance to CDWR and that the parties agreed to language to this effect in their executed contract. Exh. SER-1 at 34:6-26 (Niggli); Exh. SER-32 at 6:17-28 (Niggli).[22]

---

22 For example, with regard to the SER Agreement, Michael R. Niggli, President of SER, testified that, at CDWR's insistence, language was inserted into the SER Agreement to ensure that the Commission would not have the ability to review the rates, terms and conditions of the SER Agreement. Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26 (Niggli).

44. Somewhat belatedly, after the close of the evidentiary record in this proceeding on December 12, 2002, after the filing of Initial Briefs by the parties and Trial Staff on January 10, 2003, and after issuance of the Commission's January 10 Order,[23] by pleading filed on January 14, 2003, the State has acknowledged that "Complainants have not argued, or submitted evidence, to the effect that the absence of an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision in the remaining four contracts is itself a basis for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to those contracts. Accordingly, to the extent the *Mobile-Sierra* standard applies to the contracts with explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, it applies to the contracts without such provisions."[24] This result is consistent with the undersigned ALJ's review of the remaining four contracts and the extrinsic evidence of record as discussed *supra*.

Conclusion

45. A review of each of the four remaining contracts and of the evidentiary record in this proceeding supports a finding that the parties did not retain the right to unilaterally seek changes to their contracts, nor did the parties intend to do so. As here, where the contract has not preserved the rights of a party to seek unilateral modifications, the finding that the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review applies to a negotiated contract unless the contract expressly states otherwise serves to protect the expectations of the contracting parties that their negotiated agreement will be respected, thus promoting stability of contracts, stability of the market as a whole, and protecting ratepayers by encouraging the utilization of contracts to reduce reliance on the more costly and volatile spot market, while still protecting the "public interest" as required by the

---

23 Commission Order on Motion for Summary Disposition issued on January 10, 2003, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 (January 10).

24 January 14, 2003, Answer of California Public Utilities Commission and California Electricity Oversight Board to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance.

remedial protections afforded to consumers under the FPA.[25]

46. While the State continues to assert its position, as set forth in detail in their Complaints, that the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard is not applicable to any of the seven contracts challenged in these proceedings because, among other reasons, neither the Complainants nor the consumers they represent are signatories to any of these contracts, Complainants recognize that the Commission has rejected these arguments in its April 25, 2002 Order setting these proceedings for hearing, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087, at pp. 61,382-83, and again in its July 23, 2002 Order on Rehearing 100 FERC ¶ 61,098, at 61,397, and that these rulings bind the undersigned ALJ.[26]

47. Specifically, in the April 25 Order, the Commission rejected the Respondents' assertion that the CPUC and CEOB do not have authority to protest rates in CDWR's contracts holding that the CPUC and the CEOB "act in the same capacity as CDWR." *Id.* at pp. 61,382-83. In doing so, and permitting the complaints to go forward, the Commission specifically ruled that the Complainants "stepped into the shoes" of CDWR and therefore are bound by the same standard of review as would apply to CDWR:

> Based on the fact that in negotiating and executing the contracts at issue, CDWR represented the State of California, CPUC and CEOB, which are also State representatives, "stepped into the shoes" of CDWR by bringing these complainants. Thus, the same standard of review applies to these complainants as would apply to a similar complaint filed by CDWR

99 FERC at pp. 61,382-83.

---

25 *Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1095 (D.C. Cir. 1998). *See also Town of Norwood v. FERC*, 202 F.3d 392, 400 (1st Cir. 2000); *Papago Tribal Util. Auth. v. FERC*, 723 F.2d 950, 953 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

26 January 14, 2003, Answer of California Public Utilities Commission and California Electricity Oversight Board to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance.

48. Commissioner Massey dissented in part with a separate opinion noting his disagreement with the order's conclusion that the CPUC, "which is not a party to any of the contracts at issue," is bound by the Mobile-Sierra language in the contracts. *Id.* at pp. 61,387-88.

49. However, the Commission affirmed its ruling on rehearing in the July 23 Order holding that:

> The Commission is charged with administering the Federal Power Act and in performance of this duty, the Commission views the State of California, CDWR, CPUC, and CEOB as one and the same entity that, in this case, acted as a buyer in the energy markets.

100 FERC at ¶ 61,098 at P 23.

50. Commissioner Massey again dissented in part stating that this Order "maintains the flawed reasoning that a relationship under agency law concepts may be imputed to all parts of the California state government." 100 FERC at p. 61,397.

51. In the January 10 Order, Commissioner Massey again dissented on this issue stating "... as I have said in previous dissents with respect to this and related contract cases, the Presiding ALJ should be directed to apply the just and reasonable standard in evaluating these contracts. I do not consider these Complainants to be bound by the Mobile-Sierra language included by the contracting parties."[27]

52. Thus, while the Complainants maintain their objection to the Commission's rulings on the applicability of the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to any of the contracts at issue, Complainants concede that there is no basis in the record, under the Commission's rulings to date in these proceedings, for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to the Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley and Sempra contracts

---

[27] Commission's *Order on Motion for Summary Disposition* issued on January 10, 2003, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 (January 10 Order).

to the same extent it applies to the other contracts already before the Commission for determination.

53. Accordingly, the undersigned ALJ hereby finds that under the Commission's rulings to date in these proceedings, and subject to Complainants' continued objections to those rulings, the *Mobile-Sierra* standard applies to the Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley and Sempra contracts to the same extent it applies to the Allegheny, Coral and Mirant contracts; and, in accordance with the Commission's January 10 Order, hereby certifies the record directly to the Commission for its determination of all other issues remaining in dispute in this consolidated proceeding.

SO ORDERED.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California
v.
Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources

Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-60-003

California Electricity Oversight Board
v.
Sellers of Energy and Capacity Under Long-Term Contracts with the California Department of Water Resources

Docket Nos. EL02-62-000 and EL02-62-003 (Consolidated)

ORDER ON PARTIAL INITIAL DECISION, REMAINING SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES AND MOTIONS

(Issued June 26, 2003)

103 FERC ¶ 61,354

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, and Nora Mead Brownell.

1. This proceeding involves complaints by which customers under certain long-term contracts sought to modify those contracts with more than twenty-four (24) sellers. As a result of withdrawals, only seven sellers remain in this proceeding. The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) and the California Electricity Oversight Board (CEOB) (collectively, "Complainants") allege that the prices, terms and conditions

of long-term contracts entered into between the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) and a group of sellers of energy are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest. Complainants seek that the contracts be voidable, at the option of the State of California, or be abrogated.

2. In the order issued on April 25, 2002,[1] the Commission set the instant complaints for hearing. On January 16, 2003,[2] after an evidentiary hearing, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that the applicable standard of review intended by the parties for the contracts at issue here is the "public interest" standard.[3]

3. In this order, we affirm the ALJ's finding that the "public interest" standard of review applies to all the contracts at issue which did not contain explicit Mobile-Sierra[4] language. We also find that Complainants have not met their burden of proof under the "public interest" standard to justify the modification or abrogation of the contracts at issue in this proceeding. Thus, we deny the complaints. In denying the instant complaints, we have considered the evidentiary record developed in this proceeding, findings of the Commission Staff's Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets in Docket No. PA02-2-000 (Staff Report), and evidence submitted in the

---

[1] *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087 (2002) (April 25 Order).

[2] *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 (2003) (Partial Initial Decision).

[3] *See United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) (*Mobile*); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956) (*Sierra*); and *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas and Water Div.*, 358 U.S. 103 (1958).

[4] *Mobile*, 350 U.S. 332; *Sierra*, 350 U.S. 348.

100-Day Discovery Proceeding in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*[5]

4. Specifically, we affirm the ALJ's finding that the applicable standard of review for the contracts at issue here is the "public interest" standard. Before discussing the specific facts of the case before us, it is important to understand the historical context in which the "public interest" standard has been applied by the courts, and the legal parameters within which the Commission must address requests for contract reformation. The "public interest" standard of review was first introduced by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1956 *Mobile* case[6] and the concurrently decided *Sierra* case.[7] The U.S. Supreme Court held that, in order to justify modification of its contract, the seller in that case had to show that the contract rate was so low that it was contrary to the public interest. In the *Mobile* and *Sierra* decisions, the Court sought to mesh the respect for the sanctity of contracts under the Federal Power Act (FPA)[8] and Natural Gas Act[9] with the traditional scheme of regulation under these statutes. The Court held that, where the public utility (or natural gas company) and its customer contracted for a particular rate and did not reserve for the seller the right to unilaterally propose a rate change, the utility cannot unilaterally (*i.e.*, without the customer's consent) file a new rate under Section 205 of the FPA[10] to supersede the agreed-upon rate. The Court also ruled that the Commission's power under

---

[5] *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,186 (2002) (November 20 Order), *order on clarification and reh'g*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,164 (2003) (February 10 Order).

[6] *Mobile*, 350 U.S. 332

[7] *See Sierra*, 350 U.S. 348.

[8] 16 U.S.C. §§ 796 *et seq.* (2000).

[9] 15 U.S.C. §§ 717 *et seq.* (2000).

[10] 16 U.S.C. § 824d (2000).

Section 206 of the FPA[11] to alter the existing contract rate, after its acceptance by the Commission, is limited.[12]

5. In the *Sierra* decision, the Court gave examples of factors that would meet the "public interest" standard and allow the selling utility to modify its contract. The selling utility was required to demonstrate, for example, that "the rate is so low as to adversely affect the public interest—as where it might impair the financial ability of a public utility to continue service, cast upon other consumers an excessive burden, or be unduly discriminatory."[13]

6. Both *Mobile* and *Sierra* addressed seller challenges to contract rates alleged to be too low. In later cases, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine was applied to contracts containing rates that allegedly were too high.[14] The *Mobile* and *Sierra* cases were decided in a cost-based rate regime and consequently dealt with changes proposed to contracts that were already on file with the Commission. The application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine was later extended to contracts that were not on file with the Commission.[15]

7. In a more recent case involving a long-term, fixed-rate contract, the court held that a showing of "a mere rate disparity or a benefit to the purchasing utility or its customers for a rate modification does not suffice, without

---

11 16 U.S.C. § 824e (2000).

12 *Boston Edison Co. v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60, 64-65 (1st Cir. 2000) (*Boston Edison*) (*citing Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 352-55; *accord Mobile*, 350 U.S. at 347).

13 *See Sierra* at 355.

14 *See, e.g., Public Service Commission of the State of New York v. FPC*, 543 F.2d 757, 798 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

15 *See, e.g., Richmond Power & Light v. FPC*, 481 F.2d 490, 493 (D.C. Cir. 1973) (holding that "the contract between the parties governs the legality of the filing. Rate filings consistent with contractual obligations are valid; rate filings inconsistent with contractual obligations are invalid."). *Borough of Lansdale, Pennsylvania v. FPC*, 494 F.2d 1104, 1112 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

more, to satisfy [the 'public interest'] standard."[16] In *PEPCO*, the court also noted that the purchaser seeking a lower rate failed to "offer any evidence (beyond speculation) that the only potential non-parties here, its ratepayers, were adversely affected by the existing rates; it did not, for example, even attempt to show how much if any of the rate disparity was passed on to PEPCO ratepayers rather than borne by the utility itself."[17] While PEPCO claimed an excessive burden on its customers and discriminatory impact from the disparity between the contract rates and the OATT rate charged by the same transmission provider, the court said that "other than pointing out that the contract rate is twice [Allegheny's] OATT rate, [PEPCO] has presented no evidence regarding how the contract rates are unduly discriminatory or excessively burdensome on PEPCO ratepayers."[18] The court noted the Commission's precedent which holds that "the fact that a contract has become uneconomic to one of the parties does not necessarily render the contract contrary to the public interest."[19]

8. Based upon our review of the evidence and the totality of circumstances, we conclude that the Complainants have failed to meet their burden of proof

---

16 *See Potomac Electric Power Company v. FERC*, 210 F.3d 403, 404 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (*PEPCO*)..

17 *Id.* at 408.

18 *Id.* at 409.

19 *See. e.g., Gulf States Utilities Company v. Southern Company Services, Inc., et al., Opinion No. 300*, 43 FERC ¶ 61,003, at p. 61,016, *reh'g denied, Opinion No. 300-A*, 43 FERC ¶ 61,394 (1988), *aff'd sub nom. Gulf States Utilities Company v. FERC*, 886 F.2d 442 (1989); *accord Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc. v. Central Illinois Public Service Company*, 51 FERC ¶ 61,004, at pp. 61,014-15 (*Soyland*), *reh'g dismissed as moot*, 52 FERC ¶ 61,149 (1990); *Public Service Company of New Mexico*, 43 FERC ¶ 61,469, at p. 62,152, *reh'g denied*, 45 FERC ¶ 61,034 (1988), *aff'd sub nom. San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. FERC*, 904 F.2d 727 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (*San Diego*).

under the "public interest" standard, as defined in past cases. We find that the challenged contracts are not contrary to the public interest because the Complainants have failed to demonstrate that the contracts in question caused financial distress for the Complainants, threatening their ability to continue service, that the contracts cast an excessive burden on customers, that the contracts were unduly discriminatory to the detriment of other customers that are not parties to this proceeding, or that any other factors on this record demonstrate that the contracts are contrary to the public interest. At the time of contract execution, other alternatives were available to the Complainants; however, they chose to enter into the contracts in question, accepting market risks. Complainants benefitted from resales of the energy purchased under these contracts during the relevant period; however, after the drop in prices, Complainants became dissatisfied with their bargains and sought contract modification. The law is quite clear on that point. The fact that a contract becomes uneconomic over time does not render it contrary to the public interest. We, therefore, deny the instant complaints.

9. This order is in the public interest because it balances effective rate regulation with respect for the sanctity of contracts, as dictated by the U.S. Supreme Court under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine.

I. Background

10. On February 25, 2002, Complainants filed separate, but virtually identical, complaints seeking to modify thirty (30) contracts.[20] The contracts at issue are long-term contracts between the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) and more than twenty-four (24) sellers[21] of energy. Complainants claimed that the prices,

---

[20] The contracts which were set for hearing were listed in April 25 Order, 99 FERC at Appendix A and are provided herein in Appendix A.

[21] The complaints were filed against the following Respondents: Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC (Allegheny); Calpeak Project

terms and conditions of these contracts are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest. Complainants also alleged that these sellers obtained the prices, terms and conditions in the contracts through the exercise of market power in violation of the Federal Power Act (FPA) and that the sellers' actions were causing injury to the citizens and ratepayers of California.

Companies; Calpine Energy Services, L.P. (Calpine); Clearwood Electric Company, LLC (Clearwood); Colton Power, L.P. (Colton), successor in interest to Alliance Colton, L.L.C. (Alliance); Constellation Power Source, Inc. (Constellation); Coral Power, L.L.C. (Coral); Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc. (Dynegy); El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. (El Paso); Fresno Cogeneration Partners, LP (Fresno); GWF Energy LLC (GWF Energy); High Desert Power Project, LLC (High Desert); Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C. (Imperial Valley) and Primary Power International (Primary Power), agents for Imperial Valley (collectively, IVRRC); Mirant America Energy Marketing, LP (Mirant); Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc. (Morgan Stanley); Pacificorp Power Marketing, Inc. (PPM); PG&E Energy Trading-Power, LP (PG&E Energy); Sempra Energy Resources (Sempra); Soledad Energy, LLC (Soledad); Sunrise Power Company, LLC (Sunrise); Wellhead Power Gates LLC and Wellhead Power Panoche LLC (Wellhead Companies); Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company (Williams); and Whitewater Energy Corporation (Whitewater).

Complainants have withdrawn their complaints with the majority of the Respondents. Notices of withdrawal of complaints with prejudice were filed as to: (1) Whitewater on May 1, 2002; (2) Calpine on May 1, 2002 and May 2, 2002; (3) Constellation and High Desert on May 2, 2002 and May 6, 2002; (4) CalPeak Power–Midway LLC, CalPeak Power–Mission, LLC, CalPeak Power–Panoche LLC, CalPeak Power–Border LLC, CalPeak Power–Vaca Division LLC, CalPeak Power–El Cajon LLC and CalPeak Power–Enterprise LLC on May 20, 2002 and May 21, 2002; (5) Soledad on July 12, 2002; (6) GWF Energy on September 4, 2002 and September 5, 2002; (7) Alliance and Colton on September 30, 2002 and October 1, 2002; (8) PG&E Energy on October 3, 2002; (9) Sunrise on January 13, 2003. No motions in opposition to the notices of the withdrawal were filed, and the Commission took no action to disallow the withdrawal. Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 216 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR § 385.216(b) (2003), the withdrawals became effective at the end of 15 days from the date of the filing of the notices. The notice of withdrawal of the complaints as to Williams is granted, as discussed below.

11. On April 25, 2002, the Commission dismissed the complaints regarding the contracts that were entered into after June 20, 2001, "the date on which the Commission's West-wide mitigation went into effect, ... since the effect of the West-wide mitigation was to stabilize prices."[22] The Commission set for hearing the complaints regarding the contracts entered into before June 20, 2001. The Commission limited the evidentiary hearing to determining:

> whether the dysfunctional California spot markets[23] adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted. The hearing will not address issues concerning the Commission's policies on granting market-based rate authority or on regulation of sellers with such authority. Further, if the judge concludes that modification of one or more of the contracts is warranted, the judge should not attempt at this stage to determine how those contracts should be modified.[24]

12. The Commission differentiated this evidentiary hearing from the staff investigation of potential manipulation of electric and natural gas prices in the West. The Commission stated that:

> By order issued on February 13, 2002 [in Docket No. PA02-2-000], the Commission directed a staff investigation of potential manipulation of electric and natural gas prices in the West. We are setting the instant contracts for hearing under Section 206 of the FPA based on the arguments that the dysfunctional spot

---

22. April 25 Order, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087.

23 In this context, spot markets or spot market sales are sales that are 24 hours or less and that are entered into the day of or day prior to delivery. *See San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,120, at p. 61,515 (2001); *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418, at p. 62,545 n.3 (2001).

24 April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,384.

markets in California caused long-term contracts not to be reasonable, whereas the investigation is looking at whether there was improper behavior by sellers that may have caused prices not to be reasonable.[25]

13. In addressing the standard of review to be applied to the contracts at issue, the Commission reiterated its long-standing policy of upholding the sanctity of contracts and stated that it would not modify market-based contracts absent extraordinary circumstances.[26] The Commission determined that the contracts that contained explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language would have to satisfy the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard of review to justify modification of the contracts. The parties whose contracts contained explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language include: Allegheny; Mirant; and Coral. The Commission ruled that it needed additional information in order to determine the applicable standard of review for the contracts that did not contain an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision. The parties whose contracts did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language include: El Paso; Dynegy; Morgan Stanley; and Sempra. In its January 23, 2002 Order on Rehearing, the Commission stated that "[t]he evidentiary hearing was established to, among other things, interpret the terms of [the contracts at issue] and to ascertain the intent of the parties at the time these contracts were signed."[27]

14. In the July 23 Order, the Commission affirmed its dismissal of the complaints related to the contracts entered into after June 20, 2001, granted rehearing and dismissing complaints related to two qualifying facilities, and denied all other requests for rehearing and clarification.[28] By order

---

25 April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383, n.28.

26 April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383.

27 *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 at P 12 (2002) (July 23 Order).

28 July 23 Order, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098. The Commission clarified that the complaints against Clearwood; Fresno; Wellhead Companies; PPM;

dated November 27, 2002, the Chief Administrative Law Judge suspended the proceeding as to Williams pending finalization of the parties' settlement agreement. Therefore, Complainants continue to pursue complaints against only seven sellers: Allegheny, Mirant, Coral, El Paso, Dynegy, Morgan Stanley, and Sempra.

15. Additional background on this proceeding is provided in Appendix B.

II. Discussion

A. *Procedural Matters*

1. *Notice of Withdrawal of Complaints as to Williams*

16. On January 13, 2003, Complainants filed a joint notice of withdrawal of their complaints with prejudice as to Williams and a joint motion requesting an order to approve such withdrawal. Rule 216 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR § 385.216(b)(1) (2003), provides that the withdrawal of any pleading, such as a complaint, is effective at the end of 15 days from the date of filing of a notice of withdrawal, if no motion in opposition to the notice of withdrawal is filed within that period and the decisional authority does not issue an order disallowing the withdrawal within that period. If a motion in opposition to a notice of withdrawal is filed within the 15-day period, the withdrawal is not effective until the decisional authority issues an order accepting the withdrawal.[29]

17. PG&E filed a timely response to the notice of withdrawal requesting that the Commission clarify: (1) that Williams' settlement with Complainants and any other litigant does not compromise the claims of PG&E and other non-settling parties in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*, or elsewhere for energy and related products procured by and paid for by PG&E or that PG&E is found liable to pay for;

---

and Sunrise were dismissed and that the complaints against Clearwood, Wellhead Companies, PPM and Sunrise were dismissed with prejudice. *Id.* at P 28. The Commission also dismissed the complaints against IVRRC and Soledad. *Id.* at P 19.

[29] 18 CFR § 385.216(b)(2) (2003).

and (2) that permitting this withdrawal would not constitute a ruling upon, or approval of, any provisions of the Williams' settlement with Complainants.

18. Rule 216 does not require the party seeking withdrawal of a pleading to show good cause; on the contrary, it requires good cause for disallowing the withdrawal. We find no such good cause here. Complainants and Williams have agreed to the withdrawal, and we find no reason to force Complainants and Williams to continue to litigate when they do not wish to do so. Therefore, we grant the withdrawal at issue. We clarify that our action with respect to the withdrawal of the complaints as to Williams will not affect in any way the amount of refunds that Williams may owe in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*, or elsewhere. We further clarify that we only address here the withdrawal of the complaints as to Williams and do not rule substantively on the proposed settlement agreement between Complainants and Williams.

2. *Allegheny Settlement Agreement*

19. On June 11, 2003, Complainants, Allegheny and Allegheny Trading Finance Company (collectively, the Settling Parties) filed a settlement agreement (Allegheny Settlement Agreement).[30] The Settling Parties requested that the Commission stay this complaint proceeding against Allegheny pending Commission action on the filing.

20. Without accepting the Settling Parties' characterization of their request as seeking a "stay," we will defer action as to Allegheny at this point pending our review of, and decision on, the proposed settlement.

---

30 On that same date, in Docket No. ER01-1847-001, Complainants and Allegheny filed an Amended and Restated Master Power Purchase and Sale Agreement between Allegheny Trading and CDWR (Amended and Restated Agreement).

3. *ALJ's Ruling Prohibiting Discovery on Market Power/Market Manipulation*

21. Complainants claim that the ALJ erred in prohibiting discovery on market power/market manipulation and in admitting evidence of alleged losses while preventing Complainants from conducting meaningful cross-examination. They assert that they sought this information to counter Respondents' market fundamentals' arguments. Complainants state that, if the Commission concludes that Complainants have sufficiently proven their case without evidence of market abuse, then this issue is moot. Complainants argue that, if the Commission concludes otherwise, then the Commission should either: (1) remand for discovery and hearing on the issue of market abuse, or (2) presume that each Respondent (a) committed market abuse in a manner that contributed to the meltdown of the spot market and (b) had a basis for expecting that abuse of that type would enhance future spot market prices, the benefits of which they would not forego by signing forward contracts based upon expectations of lower prices.

22. Sellers argue that the ALJ properly excluded from the proceeding inquiry into market power and costs. Sellers claim that Complainants' argument that they should have been allowed to submit evidence regarding alleged market manipulation constitutes a collateral attack on the April 25 Order in this case, which limited the scope of the proceeding to the exclusion of market power issues and was an improper attempt to seek interlocutory appeal. Sellers dispute Complainants' assertion that they were prejudiced by the inability to present evidence of market power. Sellers further state that, in any case, there is no basis in the record for the presumption that the expectation of the alleged continued existence of market power when market conditions were tight substantially inflated prices in the long-term bilateral markets.

23. Allegheny avers that Complainants' request to conduct discovery on allegations of market power are improper and irrelevant because Complainants have failed

to show any connection between the dysfunctional Independent System Operator (ISO) and Power Exchange (PX) markets and the long-term bilateral market.

24. We find that the ALJ properly interpreted the Commission's orders in this proceeding on the exclusion of market power/market manipulation information and properly prohibited discovery on this issue. Therefore, we affirm the ALJ's ruling. We also address the issue of market manipulation in more detail below.

4. ALJ's Ruling Admitting Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Koenig

25. Complainants claim that the ALJ erred in admitting the Rebuttal Testimony of David Koenig to the extent it purported to quantify Allegheny's losses under its contract with CDWR. Complainants assert that they were prejudiced by the late production of the purported backup data to this testimony. Complainants contest the ALJ's decision to permit Allegheny to submit testimony without backup data, refuse to strike the testimony when Allegheny had not provided any backup data by the date of the hearing and require Complainants to cross-examine Mr. Koenig using backup data that could not be read in the allotted time or used meaningfully in cross-examination. Complainants request that the Commission strike Mr. Koenig's Rebuttal Testimony on costs but allow it to be refiled in the remedy phase of these proceedings after appropriate discovery.

26. Allegheny argues that the ALJ judge properly admitted Mr. Koenig's testimony on Allegheny's up-front losses because the ALJ found that Complainants were not prejudiced in any way.

27. We defer to the ALJ's finding that Complainants were not prejudiced in any way by the admission of Mr. Koenig's Rebuttal Testimony and, therefore, deny Complainants' request to strike. However, our ruling on the merits does not rely on this testimony, as discussed below.

5. Request to Include in Record Market Manipulation/Abuse Evidence Submitted in Docket

Nos. EL00-95, et al., and Motion to Reopen the Record or Take Official Notice of Evidence of Market Abuse.

28. On April 22, 2003, Complainants filed a Motion to Reopen the Record or Take Official Notice of Evidence of Market Abuse. Complainants have submitted a supplemental filing asserting the relevance of certain evidence adduced in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*, (100-Day Discovery Proceeding) to this proceeding. Complainants acknowledge that, at the time of their supplemental filing, the record of this proceeding had been closed, post-trial briefing had been completed and the entire record had been certified to the Commission. They state, however, that the Commission's February 10 Order in EL00-95, et al.,[31] raised the question of whether the Commission intended to effectively grant Complainants' request for remand for discovery and hearing on the issue of market abuse in this proceeding.

29. The Commission did not intend to grant Complainants' request for remand indirectly through the February 10 Order.[32] The additional discovery and adducement of evidence granted in the Commission's November 20, 2002 Order[33] and subsequently clarified in the February 10 Order were limited to Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*[34] The February 10 Order did direct parties to file an index for each other pending or proposed proceeding for which the filer claims its submission is relevant;[35] however, this directive was not an authorization for further discovery in the instant case or a finding that such information is relevant or admissible herein.

---

[31] February 10 Order, 102 FERC ¶ 61,164.

[32] *Id.*

[33] November 20 Order, 101 FERC ¶ 61,186.

[34] February 10 Order, 102 FERC ¶ 61,164.

[35] *Id.* at p. 61,446.

30. Complainants also request that the Commission reopen the record to admit or take official notice of: (1) FERC Staff's Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets, Docket No. PA02-2-000 (March 2003) (Staff Report) and the evidence upon which the Staff Report is based; and (2) the evidence of market manipulation/abuse introduced in Docket Nos. EL01-10, IN01-3, EL02-113-000, EL02-114-000, EL02-115-000, EL02-80, EL02-81, EL02-82 and EL02-83.

31. At Oral Argument, Complainants argued that the evidence of market manipulation is relevant to the application of the "public interest" test. In Complainants' opinion, a contract with a seller who is found by the Commission to have participated in market manipulation should be abrogated because sellers that abuse market rules and standards of behavior should not be allowed to derive windfall profits from a traumatized market at the expense of customers. Complainants also suggested that a remand to the ALJ may be necessary to adduce additional evidence on market manipulation.

32. Coral responds that market power and manipulation are assumed and are not an issue in this proceeding because when the Commission set these complaints for hearing it assumed that the spot market was dysfunctional. Coral argues that the Staff Report is not evidence upon which the Commission could base its decision because it has not been subject to discovery, cross-examination or rebuttal. Coral asserts that it is pointless to reopen the record to admit the statistical analysis in the Staff Report because, according to Complainants' evidence in this proceeding, the analysis documented in the Staff Report is not sufficiently powerful to detect the linkage, let alone "significant" linkage, between contemporaneous spot and forward prices. Coral contends that, even if the simple regression analysis in the Staff Report were powerful enough to detect the linkage between contemporaneous spot and forward prices, the results show low coefficients which do not establish an adverse effect of sufficient magnitude to warrant contract

abrogation. Coral also disputes the interpretation of the slight correlation which is provided in the Staff Report.

33. Sellers argue that Complainants have not demonstrated that extraordinary circumstances exist to reopen the record to bring in "evidence" that is not related to one of the issues at the heart of this proceeding. They note that the Commission did not require Complainants either to prove that the ISO and PX spot markets were dysfunctional or to demonstrate the causes of that dysfunction, but rather were allowed to presume conclusively that those spot markets were dysfunctional. Sellers contend that it would be inappropriate for the Commission to take official notice pursuant to Rule 508, as requested, because the "evidence" of market manipulation in several other dockets and the Staff Report are contested facts. Sellers assert that, even if the correlation analysis in the Staff Report were allowed into the record, it would not support or compel a conclusion that dysfunctions in ISO spot markets adversely and materially affected forward markets. Sellers argue that Complainants made a tactical decision not to submit a statistical correlation analysis at hearing and must live with the consequences of that decision. They point out that Complainants have not distinguished the correlation analysis in the Staff Report from any other expert evidence that Complainants might have submitted at hearing or shown that it enjoys any special evidentiary status by virtue of having been performed by members of the Commission's Staff that would reward them with the opportunity to revisit their own tactical missteps. Sellers also note that the Staff Report only recommends remand to the presiding ALJ for contracts subject to the "just and reasonable" standard of review. Sellers contend that the "evidence" of market power and manipulation for other proceedings fall outside the scope of issues set for hearing in the April 25 Order and, even if considered, would not add substantive support to Complainants' case.

34. We find that Complainants' request that we take official notice of the Staff Report findings and evidence

submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding is moot because we have considered these findings and evidence as part of the record of this proceeding. As discussed below, we conclude that, even if we assume that the allegations and findings contained in the Staff Report and the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding were true, they would not be determinative of the issues in this proceeding. We deny Complainants' request to take official notice of or reopen the record to admit evidence submitted in other proceedings. The records of those proceedings contain thousands of submittals, most of which are case-specific and not relevant to the issues in the instant proceeding; the documents that could be relevant have been submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding.

6. *Motion to Lodge*

35. On January 29, 2003, CDWR filed a complaint against Allegheny Energy Supply Company, L.L.C. (Allegheny Energy Supply) and Allegheny Trading Finance Company (Allegheny Trading) in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento. In its complaint, CDWR seeks to terminate its master sales contract and two confirmation letters that were assigned by Allegheny Energy Supply to Allegheny Trading based upon issues allegedly related to the assignment. Complainants request that the Commission consider this complaint within the context of this proceeding.

36. On December 4, 2002, the Commission authorized the assignment as consistent with the public interest and rejected CEOB's arguments against the assignment.[36] Given the Commission's approval of the assignment and prior decision not to stay the approval of the assignment pending the resolution of the issues in this proceeding, we deny Complainants' motion to lodge this complaint in this proceeding.

---

36 *Allegheny Energy Supply Company, et al.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,278 (2002).

B. *Commission Determination Regarding Substantive Issues*

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

37. In deciding whether the Complainants have met their burden of proof under the "public interest" standard of review to justify contract modification in these cases, we rely on the evidentiary record developed in this proceeding and also consider the findings of the Staff Report and evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding. The Staff Report found that spot market distortions flowed through to forward power prices, particularly those for contracts of a short-term nature, *i.e.*, one to two years time to delivery. In addition, the Staff Report and the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding suggest that the California ISO and PX markets were subjected to market manipulation and gaming. The Staff Report conclusions and the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding documents are being contested in "show cause" proceedings involving allegations and/or findings of manipulation in the spot markets. However, even if we were to assume that these allegations and/or findings were true, they would not be determinative of the issues in the instant proceeding. The Commission has already concluded that the California ISO and PX spot markets were dysfunctional during the relevant period and that rates in those markets were unjust and unreasonable.[37] Evidence of market manipulation merely suggests yet another cause of the spot market dysfunctions and the unjust and unreasonable rates in the spot markets. However, a finding that the unjust and unreasonable spot market prices caused forward bilateral prices to be unjust and unreasonable would be relevant to contract modification only where there is a "just and reasonable" standard of

---

37 *See, e.g., San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,121, at pp. 61,359-60 and 61,372 (2000) (November 1 Order); *order on reh'g and clarification*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,275, at p. 62,225 (2001).

review.[38] As we have concluded, the contracts at issue in this proceeding do not provide for such a standard but rather evidence an intent that the contracts may be changed only pursuant to the "public interest" standard of review. Under the "public interest" standard, to justify contract modification it is not enough to show that forward prices became unjust and unreasonable due to the impact of spot market dysfunctions; it must be shown that the rates, terms, and conditions are contrary to the public interest.[39] As fully discussed below, we conclude that the Complainants failed to make such a showing.

38. As determined by the Presiding ALJ and affirmed in this order, Complainants in this proceeding must meet the "public interest" standard in order to justify the requested contract modification. The ALJ concluded that Complainants failed to meet their burden of demonstrating that the contracting parties intended another standard of review to apply.[40]

39. The parties have failed to distinguish evidence required to demonstrate that a contract is not just and reasonable and that needed to demonstrate that the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" test has been met. The parties spent most of the trial and their briefs attempting to demonstrate whether the contract rates were just and reasonable. A summary of the parties' arguments and rebuttals are provided in Appendix C. The arguments which are relevant have been addressed herein. They presented very little evidence relevant to the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review. Based on the record, we conclude that

---

38 This conclusion is consistent with the Staff Report recommendation that, only for contracts subject to the "just and reasonable" standard of review, the Commission should send the Staff Report findings on the influence of the spot prices on forward prices to the ALJs to use as they see fit to resolve complaints. *See* Staff Report at V-19.

39 *See, e.g., Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 354-355.

40 *See Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 43 and 45.

Complainants have failed to demonstrate that any of the three prongs announced in the *Sierra* case has been met or that any other factor introduced into evidence warrants a finding that any of the contracts is contrary to the public interest and should be modified.

40. Based on the record, we conclude that there is no credible record evidence that the contracts at issue are placing Complainants in financial distress or that other customers will bear an excessive burden as a result of upholding the challenged contracts. In fact, one of CDWR's central objectives was to achieve a portfolio that yielded a weighted average price no higher than $70/MWh, the average cost of energy supply reflected in the IOUs' retail rates, as of January 2001.[41] In securing its contracts, CDWR achieved an overall portfolio that is diversified both in terms of energy products and durations[42] and reflects an average price of $70/Mwh.[43] The average price for the first 5 years (May 2001 to December 2005) was estimated at $84/MWh and for the last 5 years (January 2006 to December 2010) was estimated at $60/MWh.[44] Complainants were unable to demonstrate that the contracts were priced above long-run competitive prices.[45]

41. Furthermore, Complainants have failed to present evidence showing that the challenged contracts are unduly discriminatory. In the past, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine has been applied to allegations of discriminatory or preferential

---

41 Exh. CAL-51 at 10:24-11:3; Exh. AYE/SER-7 at 70:22-71:4 (Hart deposition); Exh. AYE/SER-11 at 64:11-66:2 (Nichols deposition); Tr. at 1258:14-1260:9; Exh. S-8 at 16:2-23.

42 Exh. DYN-38 at 1.

43 Exh. CAL-70 at 13 of Update of California Department of Water Resources Power Purchase Contract Efforts dated May 31, 2001 (May 31, 2001 CDWR Update); Exh. CAL-51 at 31:16-19; Exh. DYN-1 at 16:25-27.

44 Exh. CAL-70 at 13 of May 31, 2001 CDWR Update.

45 Exh. MAEM-25 at 6:20-9:22; Exh. COR-48; Exh. COR-50; Exh. CAL-163 at 1:22-2:7.

treatment to the detriment of other purchasers who are not parties to the contract.[46] No such showing has been made by Complainants.

42. In addition to the evidence on the effects of the challenged contracts on the parties and customers, the ALJ has developed an extensive evidentiary record on the totality of circumstances preceding and following the execution of the contracts at issue.

43. Specifically, the record shows that CDWR had options and at least some bargaining power when it entered into this portfolio of contracts after often protracted negotiations. During late January and early February 2001, Governor Davis signed legislation that authorized CDWR to purchase, mostly through long-term contracts, the "net-short" requirement of California's IOUs, approximating 10,000 MW.[47] The "net short" requirement is the difference between the amount of power that could be supplied by the California IOUs from their resources and the total demand for power at any given time.[48] Originally, to cover the net short positions, CDWR obtained almost all of the power it needed from either the spot market or "out of market."[49]

44. On January 22, 2001, Governor Davis' office announced that CDWR would issue a Request for Bids for Energy Purchase (RFB) and explained that the Governor "expect[s] these bids on long term energy contracts should stabilize the market and drive the price of electricity down .... This is a key step in our efforts [to] keep the lights on in California at a reasonable price."[50]

---

46 *See Papago Tribal Authority v. FERC*, 723 F.2d 950, 953 n.4 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (*Papago*).

47 Exh. COR-1 at 8:1-7; Exh. COR-25 at 16:22-24; Exh. CAL-13; Exh. EPME-1 at 30:7-11; Exh. CAL-15.

48 Exh. CAL-78 at 6:9-12; Exh. DYN-1 at 8:10-12.

49 Exh. S-4 at 16:19-17:1.

50 Exh. COR-1 at 8:7-13; Exh. COR-6; *accord* Exh. DYN-12 at 50:3-16.

45. On January 23, 2001, CDWR issued its first RFB.[51] CDWR sought bids at fixed prices for 69,000 to 100,000 GWh of on-peak energy annually and another 26,000 to 40,000 GWh of off-peak energy annually.[52] CDWR received 99 bids in response.[53]

46. CDWR assembled a highly sophisticated procurement team to assist in CDWR's purchasing efforts.[54]

47. On February 1, 2001, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 1 of the 2001-2002 First Extraordinary Session ("AB1X"), which authorized CDWR "to enter into contracts for the purchase of electric power."[55] AB1X authorized, but did not require, CDWR to make power purchases to cover the California IOUs' net short position.[56] Under AB1X, CDWR could enter into long-term power purchase contracts but could not provide any sovereign guaranty (*i.e.*, its obligations were expressly not backed by the full faith and credit or taxing power of the State of California).[57]

48. On February 2, 2001, CDWR issued a second RFB requesting a mix of products and indicating that it was

---

[51] Exh. CAL-66; Exh. COR-25 at 9:21-22; Exh. EPME-28 at 2:11-12, 3:15-16.

[52] Exh. CAL-66; Exh. S-4 at 18:14-16.

[53] Exh. AYE-57.

[54] Exh. AYE-56 at 1; Exh. AYE-49 at 11:2-10; Exh. COR-1 at 10:16-11:20; Exh. COR-8; Exh. CAL-78 at 1:7-2:18; Exh. CAL-79; Exh. CAL-12 at 3:18-21; Exh. CAL-51 at 4:5-5:14, 1:3-19, 5:15-7:3; Exh. DYN-41 at 8:4-19; Exh. COR-67 at 222:22-223:6; Tr. at 1588:10-12, 1589:23-24, 1590:18-20; Exh. S-4 at 16:5-9; Exh. COR-41 at 5:12-6:7, 12:8-15; Exh. MAEM-1 at 16:4-8; Exh. EPME-56 at 4:18- 5:1; Exh. EPME-28 at 5:7-9; Exh. EPME-35 at 1; Exh. COR-67 at 49:7-50:9; Exh. DYN-48 at 39:7-40:7; Exh. DYN-40 at 8:1-12; Exh. DYN-45 at 20:12-18, 21:13-22:6; *accord*, Exh. DYN-53 at 17:17-21.

[55] Exh. CAL-15; *accord*, Exh. S-4 at 15:21-16:2.

[56] Exh. CAL-15; Exh. DYN-1 at 9:11-16.

[57] Exh. CAL-15; Exh. CAL-66; Exh. CAL-67; Exh. EPME-56 at 3:14-15.

willing to buy from supply portfolios.[58] Like CDWR's first RFB, this RFB also emphasized that bidders, and not CDWR, would be responsible for ensuring delivery to the specific congestion zone and that CDWR would assume neither transmission nor congestion risk and continued to require fixed pricing only.[59] The RFB did not indicate a preference for 1 to 3-year contracts or any other specific duration.[60] CDWR's RFB solicited opportunities for different products to be offered up by prospective bidders.[61] CDWR received 114 bids in response.[62]

49. CDWR received a total of 213 offers to its first and second RFBs.[63] Within a few weeks, CDWR was able to assemble a portfolio of approximately 41 commitments, totaling approximately $43 billion.[64] This portfolio covered about 12,000 MW during the peak year.[65] In addition to the responses to the RFBs, CDWR negotiated with suppliers outside the RFB process.[66] There was competition among sellers to make offers to CDWR and, as a result, CDWR had choices and rejected numerous seller proposals.[67]

50. CDWR negotiated with the sellers on an individual basis and controlled what information they had regarding

---

58 Exh. CAL-67; Exh. S-4 at 18:18-19:3; Exh. COR-1 at 8:20-10:5; Exh. EPME-28 at 4:16.

59 Exh. CAL-67; Exh. COR-1 at 8:20-10:5; Exh. EPME-28 at 4:17-18.

60 Exh. CAL-67; Exh. S-4 at 18:18-19:2; Exh. COR-1 at 8:20-10:5; Exh. COR-41 at 20:13-21:2.

61 Tr. at 1253:10-11.

62 Exh. AYE-58; Exh. CAL-67.

63 Exh. AYE-57; Exh. AYE-58; Exh. DYN-40 at 6:17-18.

64 Exh. S-4 at 19:18-19.

65 Exh. S-4 at 19:19-20.

66 Tr. at 1563:2-4; Tr. at 1564:16-25.

67 Exh. AYE-80 at 196:15-25; Exh. AYE-61; Exh. EPME-28 at 11:1-3; Exh. COR-48 at 15:4-9.

the success of CDWR's procurement strategies.[68] CDWR gained negotiating leverage with each agreement that it reached with the sellers.[69] Contemporaneous statements made by CDWR and the Governor of California indicate that they fully supported the price, terms and conditions in the contracts at the time they were executed.[70] On May 24, 2001, counsel and a negotiator for CDWR, prepared a memorandum to a CDWR representative, at the latter's request, in which he stated that "[e]ach power purchase agreement was the subject of often protracted negotiations. Frequently, sellers had to concede numerous points to obtain the terms and provisions they ultimately ended up with in the agreements."[71] CDWR's lead negotiator stated that

> I can't get terribly upset by these critics who say oh, by gosh, this is higher than what the price might be. Well, hell, they don't know. We didn't just fall off a turnip truck. I am not saying we took the shirt off their back. But I am saying that these were fair, negotiated, hard-fought deals.[72]

51. The rates, terms and conditions of the contracts and concessions made by the various parties during negotiations indicate that the contracts were not the product of unequal bargaining power.[73]

---

[68] Exh. COR-63 at 2; Exh. AYE-51; Tr. 1561:14-1562:9; Exh. AYE/SER-1 at 37:18-21.

[69] Exh. AYE-80 at 271:23-272:8; Exh. J-2 at 170:14-21; Exh. COR-48 at 15:4-7; Exh. AYE-52.

[70] Exh. DYN-37 at 1; Exh. COR-61 at 1; Tr. at 1496:7-15; Exh. COR-62; Exh. DYN-38; Exh. DYN-26 at 152:16-153:8; Exh. DYN-27 at 210:24-211:19; 215:15-217:2; 221:23-222:12.

[71] Exh. AYE-51 at NAV08-016238; Tr. at 1561:14-1562:18.

[72] Exh. DYN-26 at 152:16-153:8.

[73] Exh. DYN-1 at 41:4-15; Exh. DYN-1 at 19:9-14, 22:21-23:11; Exh. EPME-28 at 4:4-5, 8:7-9:13; Exh. SER-1 at 3:25-5:6.

52. CDWR had options and did not lack bargaining power, given the number of parties who were interested in selling power to the State of California on a long-term basis.[74] CDWR was "essentially a single purchaser," and CDWR knew its actions would affect market prices.[75]

53. Although CDWR was viewed as more creditworthy than the California IOUs, its creditworthiness was still a concern to the marketplace.[76] Thus, the distribution of risks in CDWR's contracts was not symmetric between CDWR and the sellers under many contracts.[77] CDWR was, however, in a favorable bargaining position as a buyer of forward bilateral contracts because it was the largest, creditworthy bulk buyer in the State of California.[78] This fact gave CDWR a great deal of bargaining power over sellers of long-term contracts.[79] Negotiators on behalf of CDWR pressured sellers into doing deals with the State by indicating that "the Governor's office would use the media against companies that failed to deal with California."[80]

54. CDWR was able to demand and obtain many concessions from the Sellers, including obligating many, if not all, of the sellers to: (1) make immediate and/or near-term sales to CDWR at below-market prices; (2) assume transmission and congestion risk and provide high supply availability guarantees; (3) allow CDWR to dispatch the

---

74 Exh. COR-7 at 1; Exh. AYE-57; Exh. AYE-58; Exh. AYE-49 at 8:8-9; Exh. CAL-90 at 3:21-4:1; Exh. AYE-80 at 271:23-272:8; Exh. CAL-51 at 36:12-16; Exh. J-2 at 170:14-21; Exh. MAEM-1 at 17:1-3.

75 Exh. CAL-90 at 3:21-4:1; Tr. at 1856:21-1857:16.

76 Exh. EPME-1 at 53:5-54:2.

77 *Id.*

78 Exh. DYN-24 at 20:6-14; Exh. MAEM-1 at 15:26-16:4; Tr. at 2389:21- 2390:4; Exh. SER-1 at 28:9-11.

79 Exh. DYN-40 at 5:18-20; Exh. MAEM-1 at 16:14-17:3; Exh. AYE/SER-1 at 37:17-38:3.

80 Exh. DYN-1 at 23:4-5; *accord*, Exh. MAEM-1 at 16:19-23, 16:25-17:3.

supplier's generation; (4) assume the risk of changes in fuel prices; and (5) provide CDWR the option of choosing seller-supply and/or CDWR-supply of natural gas.[81] In certain of the contracts under review, even though the sellers proposed a fuel price indexing formula, CDWR insisted on a fixed price, thereby leaving sellers to bear the risk that fuel prices would increase in the future.[82]

55. CDWR rejected a number of contract offers for many reasons, including pricing, transmission constraints, credit issues and terms (*e.g.*, length of contract, type of product).[83] CDWR rejected contracts with a large number of suppliers offering, in the aggregate, more than 10,000 megawatts for sale to CDWR.[84] There was give and take involved in the negotiations: CDWR would sometimes reject certain proposals and sellers would come back to CDWR with new proposals.[85]

56. CDWR articulated the State's purchasing objectives in a report titled "Summary of California Department of Water Resources Power Purchase Contract Efforts."[86] Its objectives included: (1) creating a power purchase portfolio to reduce dependence on the spot market; (2) providing price stability and certainty; and (3) expediting construction of new power plants, peaking facilities and distributed

---

81 Exh. COR-1 at 46:3-47:5; Exh. AYE-14 at 3:1-4:20; Exh. EPME-28 at 10:4- 14; Exh. MAEM-1 at 13:5-18; Exh. MSC-1 at 6:16-7:2; Exh. SER-1 at 25:8-26:21; Exh. DYN-1 at 26:15-27:3.

82 Exh. S-1 at 25:8-11.

83 Exh. AYE-61 at DW-0015-0794; *accord*, Exh. AYE-80 at 227:12-14; Exh. AYE-59 at 90:11-13, 93:6-20; Exh. EPME-1 at 63:8-14; Exh. EPME-47 at 36:10-11.

84 Exh. AYE-1 at 4:14-16.

85 Exh. AYE-80 at 227:12-20.

86 Exh. CAL-70.

generation.[87] CDWR also sought to secure delivery of power in calendar year 2001.[88]

57. CDWR took a deliberate and systematic approach to building its portfolio of power supply resources needed to cover the net-short requirements of the IOUs.[89] It began by negotiating commitments to buy around-the-clock power (7x24) and then began to shift its focus toward meeting on-peak requirements, which was followed with an effort to secure supply reductions in shoulder months.[90] Initially, CDWR wanted as much firm power under contract as it could obtain as soon as possible so it could immediately publicize these lower prices and reduce price volatility.[91] CDWR was looking for baseload, dispatchable, peaking, unit firm, and unit contingent products.[92] CDWR sought to obtain a portfolio of contracts, some with fixed prices and some with tolling provisions so that it could hedge its risk.[93]

58. CDWR sought products of 90 days, three years, five years, and 10 years in duration.[94] CDWR sought contracts for a 10-year period because California "needed new energy in addition to getting existing energy in the [S]tate under contract," and CDWR "recognize[d] that financing of new plants would require a longer period of time from which to get a reasonable price. [CDWR] did not want to be paying for a new plant in two, [or] three years. [CDWR] expected to see some contracts come in a 10-year period for that

---

87 Exh. CAL-70 at 1; *see also* Exh. COR-67 at 141:14-142:2.

88 Exh. CAL-51 at 29:3-30:6.

89 Exh. COR-1 at 44:19-45:13; *accord*, Exh. MAEM-1 at 15:23-26.

90 Exh. COR-1 at 44:19-45:13; Exh. COR-41 at 13:19-14:1.

91 Exh. DYN-1 at 17:19-22.

92 Tr. at 1559:23-1560:7; *accord*, Exh. COR-67 at 94:7-95:20; Exh. EPME-28 at 3:16-20.

93 Exh. AYE-80 at 132:13-133:5.

94 Tr. at 1559:18-22; *accord*, Exh. CAL-78 at 8:12-18; Exh. EPME-28 at 3:18-19; Exh. S-4 at 18:16-19:2; Exh. CAL-66; Exh. CAL-67.

reason."[95] Most of the contracts entered into by CDWR to remedy its dependence on the spot market were for terms of ten years or more.[96] CDWR understood that long-term contracts were "one building block ... in solving the energy crisis."[97]

59. CDWR expected that supplies during summer 2001 could be scarce and, therefore, placed greater value on supply certainty, and sellers were offered incentives to bring supplies to the market.[98] CDWR was able to reduce its exposure to the spot market, stabilize prices and obtain a certainty of supply and portfolio of contracts.[99]

60. Based on the above, we conclude that Complainants have failed to demonstrate the financial impairment, excessive burden or undue discrimination described in *Sierra* or any other factor sufficient to meet the "public interest" standard of review. Moreover, the contracts at issue were the result of choices voluntarily made by CDWR. The record also establishes that CDWR had better alternatives[100] and was not compelled to enter into the contracts at issue here.

61. Finally, there is nothing in the record, in the Staff Report, or in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding evidence to support a finding that there was market manipulation *specific to* the long-term contract negotiations resulting in prices and terms being challenged here.

62. Therefore, based on the record, it appears that Complainants' only basis for contract modification is their dissatisfaction with the bargain. Commission and court precedent clearly establish that allegations that contracts

---

95 Tr. at 1719:2-13.

96 Exh. COR-25 at 4:1-6.

97 Exh. DYN-12 at 49:17-23.

98 Exh. EPME-47 at 26:15-27:19.

99 Exh. CAL-78 at 5:6-13, 17:9-15.

100 *See* Exh. AYE-57 and Exh. AYE-58.

have become uneconomic by the passage of time do not render them contrary to the public interest under the FPA.[101] The record clearly indicates that the challenged transactions were the result of CDWR's voluntary choices. Therefore, because there is no evidence of unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations, Complainants are not entitled to change CDWR's bargains.[102]

63. For these reasons, we find that Complainants have failed to meet their burden of proof under the "public interest" standard and contract modification in this case is thus not warranted.

C. *Partial Initial Decision*

64. The ALJ concluded that the case law is clear that where a contract fails to specifically provide that the contract may be unilaterally altered, *Mobile-Sierra* requires that proposed changes meet the "public interest" standard.[103] Under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, the U.S. Supreme Court had held that a contract with a "public interest" standard of review may be modified only if the contract is shown to be contrary to the public interest (*e.g.*, where the contract rate impairs the financial ability of the public utility to continue service, casts upon other customers an excessive burden, or is unduly discriminatory).[104] The ALJ noted that while the Mobile-Sierra doctrine arose in the context of a completely regulated environment, where, as here, the contracts were entered into under the parties' market-based rate authority, the Commission has stated

---

101 *See PEPCO*, 210 F.3d at 409 (*citing Soyland*, 51 FERC at p. 61,013). *See also Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953; *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 354-355.

102 See PEPCO, 210 F.3d at 410.

103 Partial Initial Decision, 102 FERC at P 28.

104 *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 355.

that "[p]reservation of the contracts has, if anything, become even more critical."[105]

65. The ALJ reviewed the evidence in the record proffered by the contracting parties regarding the intent of the parties as to unilateral filing rights under the subject contracts aside from the express language of the contracts themselves.[106] The ALJ found that the "evidence demonstrates that the contracting parties did not intend to preserve their rights to make unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, terms or conditions" of the Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley or Sempra contracts.[107] Rather, the ALJ found that "the extrinsic evidence of record indicates that the State had very little confidence in the Commission as an avenue for relief at the time these contracts were negotiated, that CDWR negotiated the subject contracts in a 'crisis' environment, and that for various reasons CDWR's negotiating team focused almost exclusively on the pricing terms of the subject contracts."[108] The ALJ notes that, in fact, Sempra's witness testified that precluding unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, terms and conditions was an issue of

---

105 *Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 31 (quoting April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383).

106 *See Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at PP 36-42. The evidence of the contracting parties' intent on this issue is as follows: Exh. SER-1 at 34:6-36:14 (Niggli); SER-2; Exh. SER-32 at 6:17-7:5 (Niggli); Exh. SER-34; Exh. SER-35; Exh. SER-55; Exh. SER-56; Exh. DYN-1 at 12:10-12, 26:15-18, 31:23-32:24, 33:6-9, 33:10-34:5 (Lednicky); Exh. DYN-2 at EOB-DYN-1-0005286; Exh. DYN-40 at 16:3-6 (Lednicky); Exh. MSC-1 at 9:12-18 (Hamdan); Exh. S-1 at 6:15-8:17, 11:1-11, 15:10-19:2 (Forman); Exh. S-4 at 6:11-15:14 (Tingle-Stewart); Exh. CAL-181 at 308:12-25 (Freeman); Tr. at 1633:8-1637:6 (Hart); Tr. at 2292:16-2293:6 (Smith); Tr. at 2476:5-2482:6 (Forman); Tr. at 2486:8-21 (Forman); Exh. US-1 at 13:3-14:16 (Thomas); Tr. at 2143:13-2149:11 (Lednicky); Tr. at 2293:8-15 (Smith); Tr. at 2458:4-7 (Forman). *See id.* at PP 35-42.

107 *Id.* at P 43 (*citing see, e.g.*, Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26 (Niggli); Exh. DYN-1 at 33:10-34:5 (Lednicky)).

108 *Id.* at P 43.

importance to CDWR and that the parties agreed to language precluding the Commission from changing the contract rates, terms and conditions.[109] The ALJ concluded that "[a] review of each of the four remaining contracts and of the evidentiary record in this proceeding supports a finding that the parties did not retain the right to unilaterally seek changes to their contracts, nor did the parties intend to do so."[110]

66. The ALJ also noted that, on January 14, 2003, after the close of the evidentiary record in this proceeding, after the filing of Initial Briefs, and after issuance of the Commission's January 10, 2003 Order,[111] Complainants "acknowledged that '[they] have not argued, or submitted evidence, to the effect that the absence of an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision in the remaining four contracts is itself a basis for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to those contracts. Accordingly, to the extent the *Mobile-Sierra* standard applies to the contracts with explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, it applies to the contracts without such provisions.'"[112] The ALJ concluded that:

> while the Complainants maintain their objection to the Commission's rulings on the applicability of the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to any of the contracts at issue, Complainants concede that there is no basis in the

---

[109] *Id.* (*citing* Exh. SER-1 at 34:6-26 (Niggli); Exh. SER-32 at 6:17-28 (Niggli)). For example, the ALJ found that, "with regard to the [Sempra] Agreement, [the President of Sempra] testified that, at CDWR's insistence, language was inserted into the [Sempra] Agreement to ensure that the Commission would not have the ability to review the rates, terms and conditions of the [Sempra] Agreement." *Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC at n.22 (*citing* Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26 (Niggli)).

[110] *Id.* at P 45.

[111] *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 (2003) (January 10 Order).

[112] *Id.* at P 44 (*citing* Answer of the California Public Utilities Commission and California Electricity Oversight Board to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance, January 14, 2003 (January 14 Answer)).

record, under the Commission's rulings to date in these proceedings, for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to the Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley and Sempra contracts[, contracts at issue which did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language,] to the same extent it applies to the other contracts [with explicit Mobile-Sierra provisions] already before the Commission for determination.[113]

D. *Exceptions to Partial Initial Decision*

1. *Evidence of Market Manipulation and the Exercise of Market Power*

a. *Argument*

67. Complainants argue that the ALJ erroneously concluded that the Commission limited the scope of the evidentiary hearing to matters other than market manipulation and the exercise of market power. They state that the Commission correctly ruled that proof of the exercise of market power would not be required for Complainants to prevail; however, they contend that the Commission never ruled that such proof should not be allowed. Complainants contend that it would not have been appropriate for the Commission to restrict Complainants' Section 206 rights by prohibiting discovery and precluding evidence of sellers' exercise of market power. They assert that such proof would: (1) provide direct evidence that sellers who were actively inflating spot market prices would expect to continue to do so and thus inflate forward prices; (2) rebut Respondents' argument that economic fundamentals alone explain the spot prices and forward prices during the California crisis; and (3) undercut

---

113 *Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 52. *See also*, January 14 Answer at P 7. However, as noted below, Complainants argue that here the "just and reasonable" standard and the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard effectively merge because it is contrary to the public interest to charge unlawful rates to the public.

Respondents' argument that the "sanctity" of contracts should be upheld.

68. Complainants argue that Reliant's alleged misconduct[114] stipulated to in Docket No. PA02-2-001 offers direct proof on the central issue that was set for hearing in this proceeding: the dysfunctional exercise of market power in the California PX spot market adversely affecting the long-term bilateral market by artificially inflating forward prices. They contend that such evidence disproves Respondents' experts' claims that market fundamentals during May-June 2000 explain the price inflations that began in May-June 2000 and persisted through June 2001. They conclude that excluding such direct proof on the threshold issue was erroneous.

b. *Responses*

69. Trial Staff argues that this exception is merely an attempt to bolster Complainant's contention that the ALJ should have allowed discovery and presentation of evidence of market power and market manipulation at the hearing. It contends that the exception is misplaced since it is not pertinent to the subject matter of the Partial Initial Decision and Complainants have properly briefed this issue directly to the Commission in the second portion of this proceeding. Trial Staff states that Complainants have improperly presented evidence on the merits of an issue ruled outside the scope of the hearing and that the Commission should not countenance Complainant's reliance on extra-record evidence through their citation to the Reliant trader transcripts.

---

[114] Complainants refer to Reliant's alleged withholding of approximately 2,000 MW of capacity from the market and falsely reporting to brokers that it needed to buy electricity for the third quarter of 2000 because it foresaw insufficient capacity in its own generation due to emissions (NOx) constraints and/or other capacity factor limitations.

70. Allegheny, Coral, Dynegy, El Paso, Mirant, Morgan Stanley and Sempra (collectively, Sellers)[115] argue that the Partial Initial Decision did not open the door for Complainants to restate objections to prior rulings or to submit irrelevant and prejudicial evidence into the record that closed on December 12, 2002. Sellers note that this issue is not a legitimate exception because it falls outside the scope of issues to be addressed by the ALJ as set forth not only in the Commission's April 25, 2002 order but also the January 10, 2003 order. Sellers request that the challenge to rulings on the scope of the hearing in any of Complainants' briefs be rejected as an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission's April 25, 2002 order which limited the scope of the evidentiary hearing to matters other than market manipulation and the exercise of market power. They argue that objections to the limitation on the scope of the hearing should have been sought through rehearing of the April 25, 2002 order. Sellers also contend that Complainants' challenge to the prior rulings of the Chief Judge and ALJ regarding the scope of the proceeding is an untimely, improper attempt to seek interlocutory appeal of such rulings.[116]

c. *Commission Determination*

71. This exception is not pertinent to the subject matter of the Partial Initial Decision which only addressed the applicable standard of review. However, our consideration of market manipulation and market power evidence is discussed above. Therefore, we dismiss this exception.

2. *Application of Mobile-Sierra to Buyers and Sellers*

---

[115] Allegheny, Coral and Mirant joined in Sellers' Brief Opposing Exceptions for the purpose of responding to assertions concerning the content and/or applicability of the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review, market power and market manipulation.

[116] *Citing Pacific Gas Transmission Company*, 56 FERC ¶ 61,430, at p. 62,537 (1991); *McDowell County Consumers Council, Inc. v. American Elec. Power Company*, 26 FERC ¶ 61,042, at p. 61,140 (1984).

a. *Argument*

72. Complainants reassert their contention that *Mobile-Sierra* should not apply to any of the contracts at issue because Complainants were not the contracting parties. However, even if Complainants were actual parties to the contracts, they argue that different factors apply when the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" test is applied to a buyer, rather than a seller. They contend that, when it is alleged that rates are too high and the buyer has agreed to pay too much, the "public interest" inquiry asks whether the buyer's customers will bear the burden. They conclude that in a case such as this one, where the rates are directly borne by the public because the buyer was a state agency purchasing power solely for the benefit of the public, the "just and reasonable" standard and the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard effectively merge because it is contrary to the public interest to charge unlawful rates to the public.

b. *Response*

73. Trial Staff and Sellers state that Complainants do not take issue with the application of the "public interest" standard to the contracts at issue, but rather with the test to be applied when dealing with a buyer, not a seller, under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine. They also note that the ALJ properly cited to *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Public Service Company of New Mexico*[117] for the holding that a buyer is subject to the "public interest" standard, notwithstanding that the contract was silent as to the buyer's Section 206 rights. Sellers also cite to other cases in which the "public interest" standard was applied to buyers without collapsing that standard into a lower "just and reasonable" analysis,[118] emphasizing two cases in which a buyer's request to modify a contract was rejected.[119]

---

[117] *San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. PSC of New Mexico*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,233, at pp. 61,852-53 (2000) (June 1 Order).

[118] *San Diego*, 904 F.2d at 730-32; April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383, Appendix A; July 23 Order, 100 FERC at p. 61,394; *Public*

74. Sellers argue that Complainants' conclusion that they should be subject to a less strict standard of review does not comport with judicial precedent which dictates that the strict "public interest" standard of review applies.[120] Sellers also respond that Complainants' allegation that the "public interest" standard does not consider the effect on ratepayers is unsupportable since this effect is considered in the first and second prong of the test.

c. *Commission Determination*

75. Complainants appear to argue that, because they are not parties to the contracts at issue and they filed these complaints on behalf of California customers, the Commission should apply the more flexible "public interest" standard developed in the *Northeast Utilities*[121] line of cases.

76. In the April 25 Order[122] and the July 23 Order,[123] the Commission rejected this assertion that a lower "public interest" standard applies. In those orders, the Commission stated that the State of California entered into the contracts at issue through one of its many agents, CDWR.[124] The

---

Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts, 101 FERC ¶ 61,293, at p. 62,175 (2002) (December 17 Order); *Nevada Power Co., et al. v. Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, 101 FERC ¶ 63,031, at p. 65,277 (2002); *PEPCO*, 210 F.3d at 412.

[119] *San Diego*, 904 F.2d at 730-32; *PEPCO*, 210 F.3d at 412.

[120] Sellers note that there have been cases in which the Commission has applied a more flexible public interest standard; however, those circumstances involved cases in which the Commission had never had an opportunity to review the disputed contracts and the Commission sought to apply a more flexible public interest standard to protect non-parties. *See Northeast Utilities Serv. Co.*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332 (1994) (*Northeast Utilities*); *Florida Power & Light Co.*, 67 FERC ¶ 61,141 (1994) (*FP&L*).

[121] *Northeast Utilities*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332.

[122] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at pp. 61,382-383.

[123] July 23 Order, 100 FERC at p. 61,396.

[124] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at pp. 61,382-383; July 23 Order, 100 FERC at p 61,396.

Commission does not believe that a different standard of review should apply because these contracts are being challenged by other agents of the State of California, namely CEOB and CPUC.[125] The Commission stated that, in performance of its duty of administering the FPA, it views the State of California, CDWR, CPUC, and CEOB as one and the same entity that, in this case, acted as a buyer in the energy markets.[126] Accordingly, we deny this exception.

3. *Countervailing Policy Goals and Appropriateness of Modification*

a. *Argument*

77. Complainants assert that the Partial Initial Decision ignores an overriding policy: the public's interest in just and reasonable rates. They also contend that the *Mobile-Sierra* principles would not be compromised if the instant contracts are modified because: (1) the contracts were signed during an extraordinary market meltdown; (2) the contracts were signed after the Commission gave notice in its December 15 Order that it was concerned about forward prices and would entertain after-the-fact challenges; and (3) the requested remedy would allow every seller to recover all its legitimate costs, plus a reasonable rate of return. They conclude that the remedy requested in these extraordinary circumstances would not create precedent that would impede contract formation in the normal course.

b. *Response*

78. Trial Staff notes that the ALJ did not determine whether the contracts should be modified. It states that the ALJ merely noted that, if the parties have not preserved their rights to seek unilateral modifications, then the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review serves to protect the expectations of the contracting parties that their negotiated agreement will not be modified unless in the public interest.

---

125 *Id.*

126 July 23 Order, 100 FERC at p. 61,396.

79. Sellers argue that Complainants' criticism of the policy considerations cited by the ALJ are unjustified because they flow directly from judicial and Commission precedent.[127]

c. *Commission Determination*

80. The policy considerations raised here by Complainants were beyond the scope of the Partial Initial Decision. The ALJ was not directed by the Commission to address whether specific contracts should be modified and therefore did not do so. We addressed these policy considerations above, however.

4. *Application of the* Mobile-Sierra *Standard to Market-Based Rate Contracts*

a. *Initial Contract Review Under "Just and Reasonable" Standard*

i. *Argument*

81. Snohomish argues that, because in the market-based rate context there is no initial review and approval of contract provisions such as price and term, the protections guaranteed by the FPA which ensure that all rates, terms and conditions of service are just and reasonable[128] are circumvented if the "public interest" standard is applied to market-based rate contracts.[129]

ii. *Response*

82. Trial Staff points out that, after determining that none of the Respondents possessed the ability to exercise

---

[127] *Citing* Partial Initial Decision at P 45 n.25 (*citing Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1095 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (*Texaco*); *Town of Norwood v. FERC*, 202 F.3d 392, 400 (1st Cir. 2000); *Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953); November 1 Order, 93 FERC at p. 61,359.

[128] *Citing* 16 U.S.C. §§ 824d, 824e (2000).

[129] It asserts that, in *FP&L*, 67 FERC at p. 61,398, the Commission rejected the notion that it is or should be bound by the "public interest" standard when it initially reviews a contract. *See also, Northeast Utilities*, 66 FERC at p. 62,082; *Pennsylvania Electric Co. v. FERC*, 11 F.3d 207, 210 (D.C. Cir. 1993).

market power, the Commission granted all of the Respondents in this proceeding market-based rate authority. Trial Staff argues that, therefore, by definition the rates, terms and conditions of the actual contracts that Respondents negotiated in the market place are deemed just and reasonable. Trial Staff concludes that the need for prior Commission approval of these contracts has been met because the rates, terms and conditions included within these agreements are presumed just and reasonable. Trial Staff claims that Snohomish is taking issue not only with the determination that the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard applies but also with the validity of market-based rates generally.

83. Sellers argue that Snohomish misapprehends and/or seeks to collaterally attack the Commission's established notice and filing requirements and how they apply to market-based rates. They state that the application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine cannot depend on the filing and approval of a contract if no such approval is available from, much less required by, the Commission. Sellers contend that Snohomish fails to recognize the Commission's discretion to authorize and implement its own filing requirements[130] and the sound policy decision behind the Commission's decision not to require individual market-based rate contracts to undergo additional review before they can become effective.[131]

iii. *Commission Determination*

84. As noted in *GWF*,[132] if we were required to examine every long-term service agreement as if the seller was

---

130 *Citing* 16 U.S.C. § 824d(c) (2000).

131 *Citing GWF Energy LLC and Southern Co. Servs. Inc.*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,297, at p. 62,391 (2001), *reh'g denied, GWF Energy LLC*, 98 FERC ¶ 61,330 (2002) (*GWF*), *appeal docketed sub nom. Public Utilities Commission of California v. FERC*, No. 02-1108 (D.C. Cir. filed April 12, 2002), dismissed June 18, 2002.

132 *GWF*, 98 FERC at pp. 62,390-91.

seeking new market-based rate authority, it would make the original grant of market-based rate authority (i.e., the original acceptance of the market-based rate tariff) a pointless exercise of no value to anyone. A new determination concerning the justness and reasonableness of a long-term service agreement is therefore unnecessary because such a determination has, in effect, already been made in the acceptance, and continuing effectiveness, of the market-based rate tariff pursuant to which a long-term service agreement is filed. The required mechanisms for ensuring that market-based rates are just and reasonable are in place: (1) prior to selling at market-based rates, sellers are required to file their proposed market-based rate tariffs for Commission review and demonstrate that they lack generation and transmission market power and control no other barriers to entry and that there is no affiliate abuse or reciprocal dealing; and (2) sellers file triennial updates thereafter. If Snohomish were correct, no contract made under market-based authority would protect the parties' contractual expectations as envisioned by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Mobile-Sierra*. Moreover, the Commission has expressly rejected this proposition[133] and expressly excluded from the subjects set for hearing issues concerning the Commission's policies on granting market-based rate authority or on regulation of sellers with such authority.[134] Accordingly, we reject this exception.

b. *Authority to Approve Market-Based Rates*

i. *Argument*

85. Snohomish claims that the Partial Initial Decision exceeds the Commission's authority to approve market-based rates by allowing rates that are unreasonable,

---

133 *See GWF*, 98 FERC at pp. 62,390-91; *State of California ex rel. Lockyer v. British Columbia Power Exchange Corp.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,247 at p. 62,063 (2002), *reh'g denied*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,295 (2002), *appeal filed sub nom. State of California v. FERC*, No. 02-73093, 9th Cir.

134 April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,384.

imposing on customers the burden of proving that markets were not competitive, and presuming that market-based rates alone produce competition which results in virtually any price falling within the zone of reasonableness.

ii. *Response*

86. Trial Staff notes that the ALJ recognized that valid, market-based rates are just and reasonable rates unless the public interest requires that they be changed. Trial Staff also points out that the FPA and Natural Gas Act (NGA) place the burden of proof on those advocating a change in the status quo. Trial Staff argues that, because Complainants seek to abrogate or modify the instant contracts, they bear the burden of proof which the Commission has stated is a "heavy burden" given the request to modify contracts which were entered into voluntarily in a market-based rate environment.[135]

iii. *Commission Determination*

87. Market-based rates are authorized based upon a finding that a seller lacks market power and that, therefore, the seller's rates will be just and reasonable. Over time, the rates in a specific contract may become unjust and unreasonable. If the contract rates become unjust and unreasonable (*i.e.*, not what a competitive market would produce) and the contract does not permit a "just and reasonable" review, the contract rates over the life of the contract may be changed only if found to be contrary to the public interest pursuant to the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine.[136]

88. In this proceeding, CDWR adopted a contractual arrangement under which the Commission maintains the ability under Section 206 of the FPA to replace rates only if they are contrary to the public interest. As stated in the April 25 Order, the burden of proof in this case is a "heavy burden" given that the contracts were entered into

---

[135] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383.

[136] *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 355.

voluntarily in a market-based rate environment.[137] Complainants have not met their "heavy burden" because they have not shown that the rates in the instant contracts are contrary to the public interest. Therefore, we dismiss this exception.

c. *Legislative History of the FPA*

i. *Argument*

89. Snohomish argues that the legislative history of the FPA indicates that Congress did not intend to grant private contracts, including independently negotiated bilateral contracts, immunity from the Commission's oversight responsibilities. Snohomish also contends that the Commission's prior rulings and the legislative history of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Energy Policy Act) indicate that, even though Congress intended to promote competition in the industry and the electricity markets have become more competitive than when the FPA was first enacted, Congress did not intend to alter the Commission's Section 205 and 206 authority to modify or terminate jurisdictional contracts and/or rate schedules.[138]

ii. *Response*

90. Trial Staff states that private contracts are not immune from Commission oversight. It argues that the Commission would order an appropriate remedy if the contracts were not in the public interest because they imposed an excessive burden on customers, were unduly discriminatory or were entered into as a result of market power or market manipulation. Trial Staff contends that the issue is not whether the Commission will perform its regulatory duties but whether Complainants have carried their burden of proof to warrant contract reformation.

ii. *Commission Determination*

---

[137] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383.

[138] *Citing City of Bedford, Virginia, et al. v. Appalachian Power Company*, 87 FERC ¶ 61,037 at p. 61,139 (1999).

91. We agree that private contracts are not subject to immunity from the Commission's oversight responsibilities. Indeed, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine recognizes that, even if parties agree to limit their unilateral rights to amend contracts, they cannot eliminate the Commission's indefeasible right to replace rates that are contrary to the public interest.[139] However, under long-standing court precedent, the fact that a contract rate may no longer be just and reasonable does not equate to a demonstration that the contract is contrary to the public interest. We also agree that nothing in the Energy Policy Act altered the Commission's Section 205 and 206 authority to amend contracts. The Commission is following the requirements of Sections 205 and 206, as interpreted by the *Mobile-Sierra* line of cases, in analyzing the evidence before us. The fact is that Complainants have failed, based upon this record, to show that the contracts at issue are contrary to the public interest. Therefore, we deny this exception.

5. *Implied Waiver of Section 206 Rights*

a. *Argument*

92. Snohomish claims that the ALJ's conclusion that parties can waive Section 206 rights by implication is contrary to established precedent.[140] It also argues that the ALJ's reliance on *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Public Service Co. of New Mexico*[141] is misplaced because: (1) the Commission there concluded that the parties had contemplated the possibility of a rate decrease but

---

139 *See Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953. *See also, id.* at 954 ("The Commission's obligation to insure that rates do not violate that prescription [that they are in the public interest] is imposed for the direct benefit of the public at large rather than (like the prescription of just and reasonable rates) for the direct benefit of the seller and purchaser; and it therefore cannot be waived or eliminated by agreement of the latter").

140 *Citing Sithe/Independent Power Partners v. Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.*, 76 FERC ¶ 61,285, at p. 62,458 (1996); *Boston Edison*, 233 F.3d at 67.

141 June 1 Order, 91 FERC ¶ 61,233.

prohibited the filing for such a decrease as an express and integral part of the bargain struck by the contracting parties; and (2) the contract there had been approved by the Commission as just and reasonable, and the Commission found that contractual language could not restrict the Commission's review of a contract upon initial filing.

b. *Response*

93. Trial Staff and Sellers responds that the case law is unambiguous that, when contracts are negotiated in the absence of clear contractual language allowing unilateral contract modification under Section 206, the party seeking change must meet the "public interest" standard.

c. *Commission Determination*

94. The Complainants in this case were given an opportunity to provide evidence demonstrating the parties' intent to apply the "just and reasonable" standard to the contracts at issue. Instead, they argued at hearing as well as in their post-hearing briefs that the "just and reasonable" standard and the "public interest" standard merge because it is contrary to the public interest to charge unlawful rates to the public. The Commission and court precedent establish that the "public interest" standard and the "just and reasonable" standard of review are two separate standards and thus cannot be collapsed into one standard of review.[142] The weight of the record evidence on the circumstances surrounding execution of the challenged contracts demonstrates that the parties intended the "public interest" standard of review to apply to the contracts at issue. On this basis, we therefore affirm the Initial Decision's conclusion that the "public interest" standard of review applies to these particular contracts and deny exceptions on this issue.

6. *Satisfaction of the Mobile-Sierra Standard*

a. *Argument*

---

142 *See, e.g., Sierra* at 354-5 (1956) and *Southern California Water Co. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 90 FERC ¶ 61,287 (2000).

95. Snohomish contends that the "public interest" standard is met here because of the devastation inflicted on electric customers across the West by the rates, terms and conditions contained in the long-term contracts that grew out of the crisis. It claims that evidence presented by Complainants establishes that the expectation that the California spot markets would continue to spiral out of control indefinitely forced CDWR to accept long-term contracts at prices and with terms and conditions far less favorable than would have resulted from a dysfunctional market. Snohomish concludes, therefore, that customers will be forced to bear excessive burdens arising from the market dysfunction into the future unless the Commission modifies these contracts.

b. *Response*

96. Trial Staff points out that the determination of whether the "public interest" standard has been met was beyond the scope of the Partial Initial Decision.

c. *Commission Determination*

97. In its January 10 Order, the Commission limited the scope of the Partial Initial Decision to a determination of which standard of review to apply to contracts without explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language and stated that the Commission would determine whether the appropriate standard had been met based upon the evidence presented. We discuss above whether the "public interest" standard has been met and conclude that Complainants have not met their burden of proof.

7. *Alleged Unlawful Deregulation of Electricity Sales*

a. *Argument*

98. Universal contends that the imposition of the "public interest" standard on a contract that is silent as to the parties' Section 205 and 206 rights to unilaterally modify the contract constitutes the unlawful deregulation of electricity sales because it allows sellers of electricity to collect rates and charges that are not just and reasonable, in contradiction with the express words of the FPA.

b. *Response*

99. Trial Staff counters that, while Sections 205 and 206 require that all rates be just and reasonable, that requirement cannot be read in isolation when a freely-negotiated contract prohibits or limits changes to that contract. It contends that the only interpretation of "just and reasonable" that affords meaning to the language of such a contract, the established *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine and the intent of the parties is that the contract price is the just and reasonable rate. Trial Staff argues that a contract price based upon market-based rates would be just and reasonable if it is consistent with the seller's market-based rate authority. It claims that such a just and reasonable rate may become unjust and unreasonable only if one of the three prongs of the "public interest" test is met. It concludes that other measures of justness and reasonableness, such as traditional cost-of-service calculations, do not apply, unless the "public interest" test is met first.

100. Sellers contend that collapsing the "public interest" standard into the "just and reasonable" standard would be an arbitrary and capricious abandonment of years of decisions upholding contract sanctity and applying the "public interest" standard when buyers seek to abrogate fixed-rate contracts.

c. *Commission Determination*

101. As discussed above, if rates become unjust and unreasonable (*i.e.*, not what a competitive market would produce over the life of the contract) and the contract does not permit a "just and reasonable" review, they may be changed only if found to be contrary to the public interest pursuant to the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine.[143] Under the contracts at issue, the Commission maintains the ability under Section 206 to replace rates that are contrary to the public interest; however, it does not have the power to

---

143 *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 355.

replace rates that are unjust, unreasonable, or unduly discriminatory or preferential to the detriment of the contracting purchaser.[144] Complainants have not shown that the rates in the instant contracts are contrary to the public interest. Therefore, we deny this exception.

The Commission orders:

(A) The Partial Initial Decision is hereby affirmed, as discussed in the body of this order.

(B) The complaints are hereby denied.

(C) Complainants' motion requesting order to approve withdrawal of complaints with prejudice as to Williams is granted, as discussed in the body of this order.

(D) Complainants' motion to reopen the record is hereby granted in part and denied in part, as discussed in the body of this order.

(E) Complainants' motion to take official notice is hereby denied, as discussed in the body of this order.

(F) Complainants' motion to lodge is hereby denied, as discussed in the body of this order.

Chairman Wood concurred in part with a separate statement attached.

Commission Massey dissented with a separate statement attached.

Commission Brownell concurred with a separate statement attached.

Appendix A

LIST OF CONTRACTS SET FOR HEARING

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California

---

144 *See Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953.

Department of Water Resources

Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000

I. Contracts for which the issue of the applicable standard of review was summarily decided:

Seller's Name–Contract Date

Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company–2/21/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–3/23/2001

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC–4/20/2001

Soledad Energy, LLC–4/28/2001

GWF Energy, LLC–5/11/2001

Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP–5/22/2001

Coral Power, L.L.C.–5/24/2001

II. Contracts for which the issue of the applicable standard of review was set for hearing:

Seller's Name–Contract Date

El Paso Merchant, L.P.–2/13/2001

Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.–2/14/2001

Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.–3/2/2001

Imperial Valley Resource Recovery Company, L.L.C.–3/13/2001

Alliance Colton, LLC–4/23/2001

Sempra Energy Resources–5/4/2001

PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P.–5/31/2001

Appendix B

The evidentiary hearing began on December 2, 2002 and concluded on December 12, 2002.

On December 17, 2002, the Commission denied Allegheny's emergency motion for summary dismissal of the complaints regarding its contracts which had been filed on October 29, 2002.[145] To expedite resolution of the proceeding as to Allegheny and other parties whose contracts contained explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, the Commission directed the ALJ to omit the initial decision on this issue and certify the record directly to the Commission. On December 24, 2002, the ALJ certified the record of this portion of the proceeding directly to the Commission, as directed, and proceeded to evaluate the record for the purpose of preparing an initial decision on the contracts of the remaining sellers.[146]

On January 10, 2003, in response to motions for partial summary disposition on the applicable standard of review for Dynegy's, El Paso's, Sempra's and Morgan Stanley's long-term contracts with CDWR, the Commission directed the ALJ to determine the applicable standard of review for the contracts which did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language and, if the ALJ found the "public interest" standard applied, to certify the record of those contracts directly to the Commission for consideration of all remaining

---

145 December 17 Order, 101 FERC ¶ 61,293.

146 *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 101 FERC ¶ 63,034 (2002). *See also*, Errata Notices dates 12/31/02 and 1/10/03.

issues in the case.[147] On that same date, initial post-trial briefs were filed by Complainants, Allegheny, Coral, Dynegy, El Paso, Mirant, Morgan Stanley, Sempra, Respondents jointly, Trial Staff and Universal.

On January 13, 2003, Complainants filed a joint notice of withdrawal of their complaints with prejudice as to Williams and a joint motion requesting an order to approve such withdrawal. On January 28, 2003, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed an answer to the notice of withdrawal.

On January 16, 2003, the ALJ issued a partial initial decision finding that the "public interest" standard applies to all the contracts which did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language.[148] On January 17, 2003, the ALJ certified the record to the Commission. On January 24, 2003, the Secretary clarified that the parties were directed to submit their reply briefs directly to the Commission no later than January 27, 2003 and that the Commission would accept the initial briefs filed with the ALJ on January 10, 2003. On January 27, 2003, reply briefs were filed by Complainants, Allegheny, Coral, Dynegy, El Paso, Mirant, Morgan Stanley, Sempra, Respondents jointly, Trial Staff and Universal.

Briefs on exceptions to the Partial Initial Decision were filed by the CPUC and the CEOB. Briefs opposing exceptions were filed jointly by Allegheny, Coral, Dynegy, El Paso, Mirant, Morgan Stanley and Sempra and by Trial Staff.

On February 24, 2003, Complainants filed a motion to lodge a complaint which they filed in the Superior Court of California.

On March 3, 2003, Complainants sought to supplement the record in this proceeding with the market manipulation/abuse evidence submitted in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.* On March 11, 2003, Respondents jointly filed

---

[147] January 10 Order, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025.

[148] *Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013.

a motion to strike this submission or, in the alternative, a motion for leave to respond to the supplemental submission.[149] Respondents also individually opposed and filed evidence, including new testimony, in response to Complainants' supplemental submission.[150] On March 20, 2003, Complainants filed reply comments. On March 25, 2003, Complainants filed an answer in response to the motion to strike and Allegheny's and Reliant's response to their supplemental submission. On March 26, 2003, Complainants filed a motion to strike submissions filed by Mirant and Sempra. On April 2, 2003, Allegheny, Coral, Dynegy, El Paso, Mirant and Sempra filed a motion to strike or, in the alternative, a motion for leave to respond to Complainants' reply comments. On April 9, 2003, Mirant and Sempra filed a response to Complainants' motion to strike their submissions. On April 10, 2003, Complainants filed a response to the motion to strike their reply comments.

On April 16, 2003, Complainants filed a Motion for Disclosure of Alleged Off-The-Record Communications and Request for Oral Argument. On April 18, 2003, Respondents filed a Motion for Leave to File an Answer and Answer to the Request for Oral Argument. On April 18, 2003, a notice was issued scheduling oral argument for May 15, 2003. On April 22, 2003, the Commission filed a summary of the events relating to the alleged off-the-record communications, and, on April 23, 2003, the Commission issued an order finding that these were not inappropriate

---

[149] On March 18, 2003, Reliant Energy Services, Inc. and Reliant Energy Power Generation, Inc. (collectively, Reliant), an intervenor in this proceeding, responded to Complainants' supplemental submission.

[150] Complainants and Respondents also submitted indexes that had been requested to be filed in Docket Nos. EL00-95, *et al.*, pursuant to a Commission order. *See* February 10 Order, 102 FERC ¶ 61,164.

communications;[151] therefore, Complainants' motion for disclosure is now moot.

On April 22, 2003, Complainants filed a Motion to Reopen the Record or Take Official Notice of Evidence of Market Abuse. Coral and Sellers filed answers in opposition to this motion.

On May 15, 2003, the Commission held oral argument in this proceeding (Oral Argument).

On June 11, 2003, in Docket Nos. EL02-60-000 and EL02-62-000, Complainants, Allegheny and Allegheny Trading Finance Company (collectively, the Settling Parties) filed a settlement agreement (Allegheny Settlement Agreement).[152] On June 13, 2003, a notice was issued shortening the comment period on the Allegheny Settlement Agreement.[153]

Appendix C

Summary of Parties' Arguments Regarding Remaining Substantive Issues

1. *Impact of the Spot Market on the Forward Market*

a. *Initial Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants allege that the prices CDWR agreed to pay in the first five months of 2001 for electricity to be delivered in the remainder of 2001, all of 2002, and into 2003 were enhanced by the expectation that the price-inflating effects of the flaws in the spot markets would not fully attenuate until 2004. Complainants assert that prices were high in the spot market because supply was tight relative to

---

151 *Nevada Power Company, et al., v. Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,080 (2003).

152 On that same date, in Docket No. ER01-1847-001, Complainants and Allegheny filed an Amended and Restated Agreement.

153 The comment period on the Amended and Restated Agreement was shortened also.

demand and that tightness of supply, in the absence of firm regulatory safeguards, created conditions in which the withholding of even small amounts of supply would substantially raise prices. They contend that tight supply in the electricity markets is the condition that activates and can be exacerbated by market flaws.

Complainants state that forward prices are based upon expected future spot prices, and forward markets are necessarily affected by expected dysfunction in the spot market. They argue that the forward prices that prevailed prior to June 2001 for delivery of electricity prior to 2004 reflected a premium above the price that would have been expected based upon the interaction of supply and demand in a functioning and competitive market as a result of the expected continued effects of spot market dysfunction. They contend that the risk premium analysis provided does not explain the gap between the fundamentals forecast and the actual forward prices. They claim that their expert confirmed that the gap can only be explained by the market's expectation of continued dysfunction in the spot market. They assert that changes in NOx regulations cannot explain the drop in forward prices. They state that new generation would not have an effect on forward prices. They argue that expectations of economic performance remained the same during the relevant two week period or that there was no unexpected news about nuclear or hydro conditions announced in late May that would have affected forward prices. They claim that the exercise of market power and changes in regulatory approach and CDWR's long-term contracting also affected forward prices.

Complainants contend that the credit concerns with the IOUs that caused QFs to go offline were a dysfunction, not a market fundamental, and adversely affected CDWR's negotiations.

Complainants claim that the structure and pricing of the long-term contracts reflect the impact of the dysfunctional spot market. They contend that over time the back-end loaded contracts will provide total revenues that match or

exceed the expected spot prices, including the high 2001 and 2002 expected prices, over the life of the contract. They assert that sellers also spread out high prices for 2001 and 2002 by increasing the number of megawatt hours delivered in the back-end years. They state that contract negotiations were driven by crisis conditions that were a direct result of the dysfunctional spot market. They argue that the forward price curves established the floor for the negotiation of the instant contracts, and the contracts are overall priced higher than the expected spot prices would otherwise suggest.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff asserts that the high prices in California's long-term, bilateral energy markets may be attributable to three factors: (1) flaws in the spot markets; (2) competitive market fundamentals; or (3) the exercise of market power or market manipulation. Trial Staff notes that the Commission placed the third outside the scope of the hearing due to the investigation in Docket No. PA02-2-000. Trial Staff's witness testified that: (1) the Commission issued orders addressing most of the flaws it identified in the California spot markets prior to the execution of the contracts at bar; (2) market fundamentals do not improperly affect forward contract prices, but rather produce price signals that such contracts should reflect; and (3) the Complainants failed to meet their burden because they did not distinguish adequately between the adverse effects of any flaws that may have remained in the spot markets and the effects of market fundamentals on the long-term, bilateral markets.

Trial Staff argues that Complainants did not show that expected future prices in the dysfunctional ISO and PX spot markets adversely affected the prices of the forward contracts entered into by CDWR, as the Commission required. Trial Staff asserts that the parties executed the contracts at issue between February 13, 2001 and May 24, 2001, after the PX spot market suspended operation at the end of January 2001. Trial Staff contends that Complainants' witness recognized that PX spot market

prices played no role in determining the forward price curves upon which the long-term contracts were based. Trial Staff concludes, therefore, that market participants could have no expectations of future PX spot market prices in determining the prices of the long-term contracts signed between February and May 2001.

Trial Staff claims that Complainants did not produce any evidence explicitly linking the ISO spots markets with the contested contracts, only providing testimony about spot market prices in general.

Trial Staff asserts that the Commission took actions to correct most of the flaws in the California spot markets that gave rise to dysfunctions prior to the execution of the contested contracts, thus eliminating any effects of the flaws on these forward contracts. Therefore, Trial Staff concludes that, even if Complainants had offered evidence on the specific effects of the ISO and PX spot markets on the contracts at issue, as required by the hearing order, they would not have been able to demonstrate any substantial adverse effect from spot market dysfunctions because the Commission took preemptive action to eliminate the dysfunctions prior to the time the instant contracts were executed. Trial Staff argues that, once the Commission acted, market participants were (or should have been) aware that this critical dysfunction that created over reliance on spot markets would be less of a factor affecting prices.

Trial Staff contends that the remaining reasons for prices to continue to be relatively high are: (1) competitive market forces (*i.e.*, market fundamentals); (2) inadequate retail demand responsiveness; (3) possibly the exercise of market power; and (4) market participants may have expected the spot market flaws identified by the Commission to continue, despite Commission action to remedy them, thus affecting their calculation of forward prices. Trial Staff asserts that forward contracts are supposed to reflect competitive market forces on prices (*i.e.*, prices are expected to and must rise to induce the

investment in new capacity that is needed to serve customers adequately). Trial Staff claims that, after December 15, 2000, prices in the spot market were becoming less and less reflective of a dysfunctional market design and thus more reflective of competitive market conditions. Therefore, Trial Staff concludes that Complainants must identify and segregate the portion of the forward contract rates at issue which was due to the effect of competitive factors and the portion which was due to other effects. Trial Staff contends that if these distinctions are not made Complainants risk overestimating the effect of any residual spot market flaws or exercise of market power on the long-term contracts.

Trial Staff argues that the position of Complainants' witness that the high contract prices must either be explained totally by a market fundamentals "hypothesis" or a market dysfunction "hypothesis" is not tenable. Trial Staff asserts that the simple correlation between spot and forward prices and a synchronous decline does not prove or even suggest that high spot prices caused forward prices to be high.

Trial Staff asserts that to demonstrate the magnitude of the dysfunction on the contracts at issue Complainants mistakenly rely on their expert's testimony which erroneously estimated "the level of overcharge[s]" in the contracts at issue "by comparing the expected contract costs with the costs of an alternative source of generation." Trial Staff notes that, after acknowledging that he made computational errors, the expert which provided this testimony filed supplemental testimony which conceded that, when corrected, his analysis would not show "that the contracts are priced above long-run competitive prices."

Trial Staff concludes that a review of Complainants' evidence shows that they failed to meet their heavy burden to demonstrate that dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, even if they had, they failed to show the extent of any such

effect that would warrant the modification of the instant contracts.

iii. *Sellers*

Sellers[154] argue that Complainants have failed to show that the dysfunctional spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets. Sellers claim that Complainants did not present any empirical or statistical analysis attempting to prove that the dysfunctional ISO spot markets in any way affected the long-term bilateral markets.

Sellers contend that Complainants' primary expert did not present any analysis of ISO spot markets, looking instead at bilateral spot markets. Sellers state that the expert failed, therefore, to provide substantive evidence concerning the relevant spot markets.

Sellers note that the only empirical analysis that Complainants offered in their direct case when corrected for numerous and admitted errors showed that the rates in the challenged contracts do not exceed long-term competitive prices.

Sellers contest Complainants' expert's emphasis on the supposedly sudden and dramatic two-week decline in bilateral spot and forward prices during late May and early June 2001 relied upon to demonstrate that spot market dysfunction adversely affected forward power prices. Sellers respond that the "two-week" price collapse theory is factually incorrect when viewed in the context of overall price trends throughout the spring of 2001 and, therefore, is not dispositive.

Sellers argue that none of the external factors cited by Complainants' expert support his theory that sudden

---

154 On January 10, 2003, Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley and Sempra filed a joint initial hearing brief which was virtually identical, expect for its discussion of the applicable standard of review, to a joint initial hearing brief filed by Allegheny, Coral and Mirant on that same date. Therefore, the following discussion of their initial hearing briefs will refer to these Respondents collectively as "Sellers."

changes in certain "external factors," such as political developments, explained the supposedly sudden and dramatic collapse in spot and forward prices better than market fundamentals.

Sellers challenge Complainants' experts' broad definition of "dysfunction" which included any market flaw combined with scarcity and a related notion of a "dysfunction magnifier." Sellers argue that this definition of dysfunction contradicts Commission precedent and well-established economic principles as noted in Sellers' economists testimony. Sellers also argue that the expert's "dysfunction magnifier" was unsupported by any empirical analysis actually proving that dysfunctions in ISO spot market affected forward markets.

Sellers contend that Complainants ignored the price forecasts that CDWR's own consultants at Navigant Consulting (Navigant) developed while the challenged contracts were being negotiated and executed. Sellers note that a version of these price forecasts, one which never contained any "dysfunction premium," substantially exceeded the market-based forward price curves for electricity that were publicly available at the time for all periods other than summer 2001 and that even the difference for the summer 2001 period was small in all but one month.

Sellers also claim that, although the expert admitted that forward natural gas prices, emission allowance costs and other market fundamentals are critical to understanding forward electric prices, he never comprehensively analyzed these market fundamentals in preparing his pre-filed testimony and, thus, had little or no basis for opining that anything other than fundamentals drove forward electric prices.

Sellers also assert that, even if Complainants had shown that dysfunctional ISO spot markets had some adverse effect on the long-term bilateral markets, they did not show that the effect was of sufficient magnitude to warrant modification of the instant contracts.

Sellers argue that their witness demonstrated that the primary drivers of forward prices were market fundamentals, not dysfunctions in the ISO spot markets. Sellers also argue that forward contracts were not symptomatic of dysfunctions in the ISO spot markets, rather they helped cure any dysfunctions that existed in those markets.

iv. *Dynegy*

Dynegy asserts that Complainants did not offer direct analysis of underlying market fundamentals to support their assertions that dysfunction in the forward markets affected Dynegy's contract price, did not present evidence that evaluated the contract price and did not address Dynegy's witness' contention that the price terms associated with the fixed and system contingent capacity and energy were not controversial or objected to during the contract negotiations.

v. *Mirant*

Mirant contends that the expert testimony presented by Complainants crumbles when applied to the Mirant Agreement and, in fact, supports a finding that the assumed dysfunctional California ISO spot markets has no adverse effect on the forward markets at the time the Mirant Agreement was negotiated and executed.

vi. *Sempra*

Sempra argues that it does not consider current spot prices in pricing electricity products and that alleged dysfunctions in the ISO spot markets did not influence Sempra's bids to CDWR. It asserts that forward price curves obtained from brokers and traders for electricity and natural gas played a significant role in Sempra's offer prices to CDWR. Sempra also took into consideration: (1) construction and operational costs associated with developing its generation assets; (2) statements by California representatives suggesting that CDWR was looking for prices in the $50-$60 per megawatt-hour price range; (3) losses that Sempra would incur by making sales at

below-market rates for the summer of 2001; and (4) the unique credit risks entailed in entering into a transaction with CDWR without credit assurances typically required by Sempra.

Sempra argues that Complainants have conceded that they cannot show that the dysfunctional ISO spot markets had any discernible effect on long-term bilateral contract prices for delivery beyond some unspecified point "into 2003." Sempra contends that, even setting aside Complainants' witness' unsubstantiated estimates of his dysfunction premium for 2001 through 2003, the magnitude of his dysfunction premium as applied to the Sempra Agreement falls short of that which would be required for Complainants to meet their heavy burden in this regard. It claims that an alleged "overcharge" of 2.8 to 3.6 percent above a purported ideal rate cannot justify the extraordinary remedy of contract modification under any standard of review.

vii. *Universal*

Universal argues that there are two conditions that must be met for market-based rates to be just and reasonable: (1) there must be a competitive market; and (2) the resulting prices must fall within the same zone of reasonableness as cost-based rates. It argues that the long-term bilateral market was not competitive because it was dysfunctional due to the market structure and the pattern of prices is in a range which indicated that market forces were not driving the prices to a "market clearing," marginal cost level. It contends that the dysfunction in the spot market did affect the long-term markets.

Universal challenges the evidence tendered by Trial Staff because it claims that: (1) its witness admitted that he did not perform any study to determine why prices were so high in the California market in 2001; (2) its witness admitted that the long-term market might have been affected by the dysfunction in the spot market, but he decided not to investigate the subject; (3) its witness

admitted that he considered only a few and selective portions of the evidence offered by Complainants and Sellers; and (4) its witness did not examine the evidence on the California market that was accumulated by Commission Staff and made available not only to the Commission but also to other agencies such as the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission. It criticizes other testimony which relied on this witness.

b. *Reply Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants charge that the lack of installed plants in California was a direct result of market flaws. They contend that these market flaws were also evidenced by a lack of incentives for new construction, changes which would affect the forward markets. They state that the combination of existing market flaws and tight supply led to sellers exercising market power through withholding supply and driving up prices. Complainants argue that the fact that they were precluded from investigating or offering evidence of market abuse created a "catch-22" situation.

Complainants allege that the Commission's November and December 2000 orders did nothing to relieve prices, but rather, caused the spot and forward markets prices to rise. They assert that the result was contracts priced at or above the forward curves, suggesting that there was an expectation of continued dysfunction driving forward prices until 2004.

Complainants assert that Respondents mischaracterize Navigant's proxy price model and its purpose. They argue that the proxy price model does not, as Respondents state, represent a forecast of competitive prices. They claim that Navigant's model is neither a forecast of market fundamentals nor an estimate of future competitive prices, but rather a conservative proxy with which CDWR could estimate revenue requirements for electricity purchases.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff argues that Complainants have revealed the weakness of their case by switching their primary reliance from their own witnesses' flawed analyses to a graph created by a witness for Dynegy to support their claim that a "dysfunctionality premium" existed in 2001 in the forward markets. Trial Staff explains that the graph displays a gap between the average forward prices and the model's forecasts for 2001 and 2002 and that Complainants contend that the gap between the two curves on the graph, which Complainants modified and included in their Initial Brief, shows that forward prices were "infected" by spot market dysfunctions. Trial Staff states that the graph, modified or unmodified, shows no such thing. Trial Staff argues that, simply recognizing that a gap exists between a curve depicting forward on-peak prices at a particular California delivery point and a curve depicting prices forecasted by a commercial software model, does not conclusively establish the existence of a "dysfunctionality premium" in forward markets.

Trial Staff asserts that Complainants' analysis of spot and forward prices for a particular two-week period in 2001 failed to produce any proof that spot market dysfunction actually affected the forward market. It notes that Complainants assert that their witness independently confirmed that the gap displayed in Exhibit DYN-31 can only be explained by expectations of continued dysfunction in the spot market. Trial Staff argues that the problem with this approach is that it does not demonstrate that the dysfunctional ISO and PX spot markets affected the forward markets and, at best, merely shows that spot and forward prices moved together during those two weeks. Trial Staff also argues that Complainants do not demonstrate the extent to which these price levels were the result of competitive market forces and the extent to which they were the result of other causes, such as market flaws.

Trial Staff argues that the fact that some QFs did not sell generation to California utilities because of credit concerns fails to establish a causal relationship between spot

market dysfunction and the forward contracts at issue. Trial Staff states that, by characterizing the credit concerns as a dysfunction, Complainants contend such withholding of power by QFs pushed forward prices up, thus proving their witness' conclusion that spot market dysfunction affected forward prices. Trial Staff asserts that Complainants' argument makes little sense because QFs did not sell their output into the ISO and PX spot markets; instead, pursuant to Section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, they sold power directly to electric utilities. Thus, Trial Staff concludes that QFs did not have a direct relationship to the spot markets. Trial Staff points out that, as explained in the testimony submitted on behalf of Respondents Morgan Stanley, Sempra, Mirant and Allegheny, beginning in December 2000, the Commission relaxed its restrictions on QFs, allowing them to sell excess output through bilateral contracts.

Trial Staff claims that Complainants were unable to prove their assertion that the pricing structure of the forward contracts, some of which contain levelized prices, was driven by the dysfunctional spot markets operated by the ISO and PX. Trial Staff asserts that the fact that the contracts at issue may have been priced at or above the forward price curves does not support Complainants' contention that the prices in the contracts incorporated the dysfunctions in the spot market and therefore must be modified to achieve just and reasonable rates.

Trial Staff states that now Complainants contend that a measure of the excessive burden on ratepayers can be found in Appendix C to their Initial Brief, which they admit is a "rough" quantification of the "dysfunctionality premium." Trial Staff argues that, not only is it too late for Complainants to attempt to quantify (for the first time) this measurement of the alleged "overcharges," but also the theory upon which they rely is flawed because there has been no showing that the forward price curves where the product of the dysfunctional spot market.

iii. *Sellers*

Sellers argue that Complainants did not and cannot demonstrate that the dysfunctional spot markets had an adverse effect on the long-term bilateral markets in California. Sellers contend that Complainants' analysis on this point is flawed because it is based upon misguided assumptions and incorrect price comparisons, including a misuse of the GE MAPS results presented by one of Sellers' witnesses. Sellers assert that Complainants constructed a faulty analysis of expected prices for 2002 (as of March 1, 2001) and then worked backwards to fill this evidentiary void by purporting to derive a dysfunction premium for 2001 forward prices. Sellers dismiss as mere theory Complainants' argument that changes in bilateral spot and forward prices during a two-week period in late May and early June 2001 demonstrated the existence of a dysfunction premium in the forward market prices. Sellers claim that Complainants' analysis regarding this two-week period fails to take into account critical changes in market fundamentals.

Sellers maintain that the evidence shows that the dysfunctional spot markets did not adversely affect the long-term contracts at issue in any material manner. Sellers assert that, contrary to Complainants' contention, scarcity alone is not a market dysfunction that affected the long-term bilateral markets during 2001. Seller's state that prior Commission orders make clear that scarcity contributed to dysfunction in the ISO and PX spot markets only to the extent that it was combined with State-imposed restrictions on the IOUs that forced them to buy power exclusively in the PX spot markets. Sellers state that the Commission eliminated these State-imposed restrictions in January 2001, thereby eliminating this contributing factor to dysfunction in the residual ISO spot markets. Moreover, Sellers argue that even if market participants could exercise market power in the ISO spot markets during conditions of scarcity, it is virtually impossible to leverage such market power into the bilateral forward markets. Sellers state that doing so is especially difficult in the long-term bilateral markets

because the market for forward contracts is not the final market available to either a buyer or seller (meaning that the buyer or seller can wait to buy or sell later in the forward or spot markets).

Sellers contend that Complainants failed to prove, under any relevant standard, that the effect of the dysfunctional ISO spot markets on long-term bilateral markets in California was of a magnitude warranting abrogation or modification of the challenged contracts. Sellers argue that Complainants have taken the position that they are entitled to relief if they show that the dysfunctional ISO spot markets had *any* effect on the contracts at issue and that such a position constitutes a collateral attack on the April 25 Order in this case, which requires Complainants to show an adverse effect of sufficient magnitude to warrant abrogation or modification. Sellers claim that, instead of making the required showing, Complainants rely upon a flawed benchmark analysis and unsupported dysfunction premiums. In any case, Sellers assert that the contract costs are below the ten-year $70/MWH target sought and achieved by the CDWR and that CDWR's payments under the contracts did not exceed the level that the retail market was accustomed to paying.

iv. *Allegheny*

Allegheny claims that Complainants' contention that the Allegheny Agreement was priced above its forward curves is patently wrong. Allegheny states that CDWR obtained a just and reasonable price from Allegheny and agreed to compensate Allegheny for the substantial risks it assumed under the contract. Allegheny argues that, contrary to Complainants' misrepresentation, at the time of the negotiations, Allegheny's 11-year, $61MWh contract was priced at virtually the same level as its forward price curves and carried a *de minimis* $10 million dollar projected "cushion" over the entire life of the long-term fixed price contract. Allegheny argues that Complainants fail to mention that, based upon Navigant's then-current forward

curves at the time of contracting and the swap-price methodology used by Mr. Koenig, the price of the Allegheny Agreement would have been $70/MWh. It concludes that, based upon CDWR's own forward curves, the Allegheny Agreement price of $61/MWh was substantially cheaper and priced far below expected spot prices, as projected in CDWR's own forward curves. Allegheny asserts that whether or not the contract was priced at or above the forward price curves at the time of Complainants' analysis does not take into account the fact that Allegheny, like CDWR, was a price taker in the volatile electricity markets and therefore was taking on substantial risks for which compensation was appropriate.

Allegheny notes that Dynegy's witness' review of CDWR's contracts, to demonstrate that their forward price curves formed the floor for negotiations, analyzed only contracts entered on or before March 1, 2001 and therefore his study did not include the Allegheny Agreement which was signed on March 23,2001 and April 20,2001, respectively.

Allegheny states that the record shows the absurdity of Complainants contention that the Commission should "presume" that the Allegheny Agreement, on the day it was signed, was hugely profitable. First, it states that the record demonstrates that the Allegheny Agreement was not "hugely profitable" because it shows that the expected mark-to-market value, based upon the forward curves from which the price was derived, was a mere $10 million. Second, it points out that Mr. Koenig testified that Allegheny undertook numerous actions to perform under the CDWR contract which resulted in realized cash losses in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Allegheny alleges that Complainants have not demonstrated that the harm, if any, to California from these contracts is of a magnitude warranting modification. Allegheny argues that Complainants' analysis of contract overcharges, as well as their conclusion that these overcharges harmed the State economy, are so flawed as to

invalidate their conclusions. Allegheny claims the corrected analysis of Complainants' evidence shows that the Allegheny contracts produce savings to the State of $67.4 million or $92.5 million per year.

Allegheny asks the Commission to reject Complainants' arguments that the contracts should be reformed based on Respondents' legitimate performance costs because they are not the appropriate measure of the just and reasonable rates of the Allegheny Agreement. It claims that a seller's costs are not a relevant test for market-based rate authority or market-based transactions.

v. *Dynegy*

Dynegy argues that Complainants has not submitted any evidence that Dynegy's price was affected by spot market dysfunction. Dynegy submits that although the State argues that Dynegy's prices were developed based on forward price curves that were affected by spot market dysfunction, it has not submitted testimony analyzing Dynegy's prices and in fact declined to do so. Dynegy contends that allowing Complainants to now argue that they have a new approach to quantifying a dysfunction premium in Dynegy's prices is "unacceptable." Furthermore, Dynegy argues that Complainants' analysis is incorrect in that prices under the Dynegy contract are 10 to 25 percent less than the forward price curves at the time the contract was signed. Dynegy points out that under the contract Complainants have the benefit of falling gas prices and that this reduction in gas prices through October 2002 caused lower contract prices. To support its position, Dynegy states that its witness concluded that Dynegy's prices were driven by market fundamentals and exhibited no material influence of spot market dysfunction.

Dynegy also alleges that Complainants misconstrue several facts to cast Dynegy in a bad light. Among the facts misconstrued is the amount of capacity CDWR must buy under the Dynegy Agreement. Dynegy claims CDWR is only obligated to take 200-500 MWs and is not obligated for

anything above that. Dynegy argues that Complainants' assertion that the tolling requirements of the Dynegy Agreement "places all gas risk on Dynegy" is false since gas prices have fallen providing the State with significant benefits. Dynegy also disputes the accuracy of Complainants' recalculation of its witness' estimation of Dynegy's contract price and attributing 2001 dysfunctionality premiums calculations to that witness. Dynegy alleges that Complainants fail to address forward price curves developed by its own consultant. Dynegy argues that the price forecasts were higher than the market-based forward price curves that existed at the time Dynegy negotiated its contract with CDWR.

Dynegy asserts that Complainants grossly overstate Dynegy's profit expectations. It notes that Complainants did not file any testimony, thus depriving Dynegy of an opportunity to engage in cross-examination or file rebuttal testimony. Dynegy argues that Complainants' figures of $635-$812 million in profits do not take into account taxes or other offsets, which would result in $387-$495 (accounting for taxes only). According to Dynegy, this amount is below its investment in its California units. Despite this result, Dynegy explains that it is "sound policy for generators to earn profits when the market is tight, enabling them to ride out the lean periods when capacity is plentiful."

vi. *El Paso*

El Paso argues that Complainants failed to show any evidence that supports their contention that El Paso's prices were above market. El Paso states that its evidence proves that contract prices with CDWR reflect market prices with no indication of market dysfunction.

El Paso contends that the fact that agreed upon price was below current spot market prices and near-term forward prices but above long-term prices predicted at the time does not indicate that El Paso's price included expectations of continued dysfunction, as suggested by Complainants. El Paso argues that what Complainants

describe as market dysfunction is nothing more than evidence of arbitrage in a competitive market.

According to El Paso there is no evidence in the record that supports Complainants' claim that El Paso's forward curves were above market. Rather than prove the point, El Paso charges that Complainants improperly assume that a dysfunctionality premium is imbedded in market and contract prices.

vii. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley argues that Complainants have failed to meet their heavy burden to demonstrate generally that the bilateral forward contracts between the sellers and the CDWR were adversely affected by dysfunctions in the California spot markets. Specifically, Morgan Stanley states that Complainants have not and can not demonstrate that the Morgan Stanley Agreement contains a dysfunction premium. Morgan Stanley points out that the record fails to demonstrate that dysfunctions in the California spot markets, when exacerbated by conditions of true supply scarcity, necessarily created conditions conducive to the withholding of power that pumped up the prices in the California spot markets. They state that such an assumption ignores the Commission's December 15, 2000 Order which specifically addressed the dysfunctions it believed were affecting the California organized spot markets (*e.g.*, the buy-sell requirement). Morgan Stanley avers that, regardless of whether power was withheld from California, Complainants have failed to demonstrate, and their expert witnesses did not provide any analysis of, a nexus between the California spot markets and the bilateral power markets in the West.

Morgan Stanley notes that its expert witnesses did analyze the relationship between these markets and testified that the pattern of prices in the bilateral spot markets at NP 15 and SP 15 was significantly different than the pattern of prices in the California spot markets. They also testified that the dysfunctions that the Commission

identified in its December 15, 2000 Order as extant in the California spot markets were not present in the bilateral spot markets. Further, Morgan Stanley argue that the "evidence" that Complainants do cite, the two-week price collapse theory and the GE MAPS model results disprove, rather than prove the existence of a dysfunction premium. Morgan Stanley argues the two-week price collapse theory demonstrates that: (1) changes in market fundamentals do account for the decline in the forward power price during the period between May 24, 2001 and June 6, 2001; and (2) the PJM market either was adversely affected by the same dysfunctions extant in the California spot markets or the PJM market suffered from the same type of dysfunctions. Morgan Stanley claims that Complainants confused, misconstrued, and misused GE MAPS model results so that they would support their theory of the case. However, it notes that when viewed appropriately the GE MAPS model results serve as an extremely conservative estimate of the absolute floor for what prices would have been.

Morgan Stanley states that the factual and empirical record evidence that Morgan Stanley and the other Respondents presented in this proceeding demonstrates that market fundamentals affecting supply and demand were the primary driver of forward prices rather than dysfunctions in the California organized spot markets and that on this basis alone the Commission should find that the Morgan Stanley contract meets the "public interest" standard.

Morgan Stanley contends that Complainants' summation of the evidence against Morgan Stanley in Appendix A6 demonstrates that the Morgan Stanley Agreement price was consistent with the forward market price when the contract was executed. Morgan Stanley states that the entire point of Complainants' exercise in Appendix A6 was to show that the "dysfunctionality premium" was embedded in the Morgan Stanley forward curve. It argues, however, that the "dysfunctionality premium" is not supported by the evidence. Morgan Stanley asserts that Complainants'

allegation that Morgan Stanley received a $60 million dysfunctionality premium completely ignores the record evidence. For example, Morgan Stanley points to the Morgan Stanley Trader who derived Morgan Stanley's forward curve and priced the contract and testified that Morgan Stanley did not include any premium for the alleged dysfunctional market. Morgan Stanley notes that it also offered evidence that it had no generation capacity to serve the contract and purchased power in the same markets as CDWR, and, as a result, Morgan Stanley was subject to the same prices and price risk as CDWR. Thus, Morgan Stanley concludes that Appendix A6 shows only that Morgan Stanley seeks to operate its business in a profitable manner and does so by offering power at market prices, neither of which is contrary to the public interest.

Morgan Stanley also argues that Complainants attempt to lump Morgan Stanley's contract along with other Respondents' contracts through unsupported assumptions, general conjecture and improperly attempting to shift the burden of proof onto Morgan Stanley. Morgan Stanley states that Complainants attempt to shift the burden of proof onto Respondents on two central issues: (1) Complainants "ask the Commission to *presume* that each contract, on the date it was signed, were [sic] hugely profitable ... far exceeding any legitimate costs;" and (2) Complainants argue that "[t]he Respondents *have not explained*, nor can they, why a purchaser with superior leverage would (1) pay more, not less, than the sellers' forward price curves, (2) enter into contracts for 10 years, when it really wanted 1-3 year deals, and (3) agree to purchase large amounts of energy in the out years of the contract with relatively small amounts delivered in the early years when the purchaser desperately needed the power."

viii. *Mirant*

Mirant argues that Complainants did not demonstrate that the Mirant Agreement price was above Mirant's internal forward curve. Mirant states that, although

Complainants purport to rely on Mirant witness' calculation of a levelized price from Mirant's forward price curves, it fails to mention some explicit caveats noted by the witness in presenting his calculations. First, Mirant notes that the witness explained that his calculation of a levelized price was based upon Mirant's historical forward curves for "mid" prices while Mirant's actual offer price for the CDWR (or any other) sale would have been developed using the ask price curve, which is by definition higher than the mid curve. Second, Mirant notes that the witness explained that the forward price curve he used reflected prices for trades of relatively small blocks of power, usually 25 to 50 MW, while Mirant committed to sell CDWR a 500 MW block of power. Mirant argues that the sale of such a large block would tend to command a higher price because as the witness testified "larger sales would be expected to move the market." Thus, Mirant notes that both of these factors tend to depress the forward curve-based price calculation.

Mirant also argues that Complainants failed to mention that forward prices climbed considerably between May 17, 2001, when Mirant and CDWR reached agreement as to basic terms of the Mirant Agreement, and May 22, 2001, when the parties executed the contract. Further, Mirant notes that, according to Complainants' expert witness, the May 22 date is the more appropriate date for purposes of comparison since "either party could walk away from a contract until the contract was finalized."

Mirant states that the only analysis in the record of expected competitive prices as of mid-May 2001 demonstrates that the Mirant Agreement was not adversely affected by spot market dysfunction. It contends that Complainants failed to acknowledge that the GE MAPS modeling analysis relies on market information as of March 1, 2001 only, more than two months before the Mirant Agreement was negotiated.

ix. *Sempra*

Sempra contends that Complainants provided little, if any, record evidence directly addressing the Sempra Agreement. Sempra argues that the State provides no probative evidence demonstrating that the dysfunctional ISO spot markets adversely affected the rates, terms or conditions in the Sempra Agreement. Sempra argues that the State mischaracterized and misused the GE MAPS price forecast model, which did not and cannot model all relevant market fundament in particular, scarcity rents. Sempra contends that, in its initial brief, it demonstrated that this March 1, 2001 price forecast provides no probative evidence concerning the existence or magnitude of a dysfunction premium after March 1, 2001, when the Sempra Agreement was largely negotiated and finally executed. Sempra argues that this analysis was based on information regarding market fundamentals and forward price curves available more than two months prior to the execution of the Sempra Agreement and the expert nor Complainants ever attempted to calculate a dysfunction premium in a similar manner for any period after March 1, 2001. Sempra concludes that it is clear that Complainants failed to demonstrate the existence of a dysfunction premium in forward prices at any point after March 1, 2001, much less on May 4, 2001 (the day on which the Sempra Agreement was executed).

Sempra claims that Sellers' witnesses testified that a version of this unadjusted fundamental price forecast for on-peak prices prepared by Navigant in May 2001 (the month during which the Sempra Agreement was executed) showed that forecasted prices were significantly above forward prices for October 2001 through the 2005 calendar year, while they were below forward prices only during the summer of 2001. Sempra asserts that compared to the Navigant price forecast, which is more probative of CDWR's market expectations in the spring of 2001 than the interpretation of the after-the-fact GE MAPS results, the prices in the Sempra Agreement did not contain a dysfunction premium.

Sempra states that it did not rely on publicly available forward price curves in developing offer prices for the vast majority of its deliveries. Sempra asserts that Sempra considered a variety of factors other than forward price curves for electricity when pricing its bid to CDWR. Sempra also points to statements by California representatives indicating that CDWR was looking for prices in the $50-$60 per MWh range which became the starting point for Sempra's calculations of its offer prices. Sempra claims that it was hoping to develop a fleet of generation facilities in and around California that would be supported by the Sempra Agreement and that could be used to hedge Sempra's sales to CDWR. Accordingly, Sempra asserts that its offer price took into account the substantial costs and risks associated with its generation development, while also factoring into its offer price certain costs and risks associated with contractual terms demanded by CDWR. Sempra argues that it only looked to forward price curves for electricity for the first two years of the term of the Sempra Agreement (during which time only 3 percent of the total power provided to CDWR under the Agreement would be delivered); however, Sempra had to look at forward price curves for power for these first two years because Sempra was aware that it would be acting as a purchaser during that time. Sempra argues that Complainants acknowledge that Sempra only looked at forward price curves to price "near term forward energy."

Sempra argues that, even assuming arguendo, that the Commission had found market power to be an issue relevant to this proceeding, the evidence shows that Sempra did not possess market power at the time of the negotiation and execution of the Sempra Agreement. Sempra contends that there is no procedural or substantive basis for applying the presumptions on market power issues that Complainants request. Sempra states that Sempra did not obtain authority from the Commission to make sales at market-based rates until April 10, 2001 and that Sempra did not have any power available for sale in 2001. Thus, Sempra

argues that it was not "on the spot market" until CDWR made it clear that summer 2001 sales at below-market rates were a precondition to Sempra obtaining a long-term deal with CDWR and Sempra was forced to go out into the spot market as a purchaser to procure power to resell to CDWR. Sempra states that it could not have played any part in the "meltdown of the spot market" which occurred in 2000 and early 2001. Second, Sempra states that the record also shows that there is simply no reason to presume that Sempra expected market power (or any other factor) to keep spot prices high because Sempra expected that spot prices would fall as a result of market fundamentals by 2002. Finally, Sempra contends that the record evidence demonstrates that there is no basis to presume that the rates under the Sempra Agreement reflect the expected future exercise of market power by Sempra or anyone else because, as a general matter, Complainants' own evidence demonstrates that the prices under the Sellers' contracts do not exceed long-run competitive prices.

x. *Universal*

Universal argues it has shown that the dysfunctions in the California spot market affected long term pricing and that market forces were not acting as a regulatory constraint. It argues that market-based rates must be in the same "zone of reasonableness" as cost-based rates. Universal argues that almost $600,000,000 a year in overcharges is evidence of unjust and unreasonable rates that should be investigated.

Universal questions what constitutes the "zone of reasonableness" as well as how this zone is to be derived in a market-based environment. Universal claims that Sellers did not provide data to show that Sellers' rates fell within a zone of reasonableness. Therefore, Universal avers that failure to provide this data is conclusive that the rates were unjust and unreasonable. Universal also argues that it has shown that prices under Sellers contracts were so scattered and so great "that no claim could be made that market

forces were keeping prices within the zone of reasonableness." Universal concludes that it has successfully shown that the rates in question are unjust and unreasonable and that the Commission must act on this showing or violate the FPA.

2. *Benchmark Analyses*

a. *Initial Brief.*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants allege that the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark requires adjustments to be useful in evaluating the contracts. They contend that the prices in the Allegheny, Coral, El Paso and Morgan Stanley contracts significantly exceed the benchmark even when $74/MWh is used as the benchmark for the first five years.

Complainants claim that the fact that the contracts incorporate the expected results of the dysfunctional spot markets is enough to satisfy the "public interest" standard and move to the remedy phase of these proceedings. They argue that in the absence of the presumptive protection of workably competitive markets, the only other logical method to determine just and reasonable rates for these contracts, while ensuring that all legitimate costs and a reasonable return are recouped by Sellers, is to resort to the traditional cost-of-service approach. Complainants note that, due to the ALJ's ruling that precluded discovery of Respondents' costs, Complainants were unable to demonstrate the excesses embodied in the rates in question in comparison to the Respondents' costs. They state that notwithstanding the limiting effects of this ruling, they developed two surrogate measures of the overcharges that demonstrate that the magnitude of the adverse effect of the spot market dysfunctions on the instant contracts is substantial. First, they assert that evidence establishes that the price in each of the contracts contain the dysfunctionality premiums embedded in the forward price curves for 2001 and 2002. Second, they restate that the Commission's benchmark provides additional corroboration

of the magnitude of the adverse effect embedded in each of the contracts.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff argues that the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark should not be adjusted as Complainants' witnesses suggest. Trial Staff discredits Complainants' witness who challenged the accuracy of the benchmark because he did not know precisely what was contained in the benchmark because the Western Power Trading Forum did not provide the actual derivation of the $67.45/MWh rate that was adopted by the Commission and, therefore, could not say with any degree of certainty that the rate did not incorporate a 10 percent rate reduction from pre-restructuring levels, as the Commission stated in its December 15, 2001 order, or that the rate did not account for the value of ancillary costs included in pre-restructuring retail rates.

Trial Staff contends that to the extent a contract price fell below $74/MWh it should be considered just and reasonable. Trial Staff notes that the Governor had requested that the CPUC develop a benchmark and that Complainants' witness could not explain why it would not be reasonable to assume that the $70/MWh target sought and achieved in the CDWR's portfolio was the benchmark. Trial Staff points out that the $70/MWh price target which CDWR achieved for its entire portfolio of long-term contracts was approved for pass-through by the CPUC. Additionally, Trial Staff asserts that the witness' valuation of the costs of ancillary services is overstated and based upon erroneous assumptions. Trial Staff claims that the witness' contention that the level of the benchmark was influenced by natural gas prices tainted by market abuse is without merit because no evidence was presented that market abuse occurred prior to the restructuring of the electric industry in California and it is unclear how historic embedded costs could be influenced by natural gas prices tainted by market abuse. Trial Staff points out that, under

the witness' assertion that the benchmark reflects the historic costs of a portfolio of assets and therefore can only be meaningfully compared to a whole portfolio of contracts that serve an entire load profile, CDWR's portfolio of long-term contracts which is below the $74/MWh benchmark would be found just and reasonable. Trial Staff claims that, in arguing that the benchmark had to be translated into product-specific benchmarks to be a meaningful standard for comparison with contracts at issue, Complainants' witness erroneously assumed that the $74/MWh price was not comparable to the price for a 24-by-7 contract that offers power at a flat level throughout the day and year. Trial Staff also asserts that, in deriving their product specific benchmarks, Complainants' witness also erroneously used a cost ratio based on 1997 embedded costs, notwithstanding the fact that the $74/MWh benchmark was based upon 1996 costs. Trial Staff concludes that based upon these erroneous assumptions Complainants' witness concluded that the prices in the Allegheny, Coral, El Paso, Morgan Stanley were above what they would have been if it had not been for the dysfunctional spot market.

Trial Staff does not believe that it is necessary to make any adjustment to the $74/MWh benchmark for the difference in the duration of the contracts and contract prices below the benchmark should be deemed just and reasonable. Trial Staff argues that the three methods of adjustment proposed by Complainants' witnesses are flawed and should not be used. Trial Staff asserts that the Sempra contract is below the benchmark because it provides an average rate below $70/MWh, with power provided during the summer of 2001 at below-market rates. Trial Staff states that the other contracts are more difficult to compare because they are above the $74/MWh benchmark and sets forth the difficulties in the comparison for the Dynegy, El Paso and Morgan Stanley contract.

Trial Staff argues that CDWR was unable to demonstrate any significant adverse affects that these contracts would have on either the California economy or

the wholesale and/or retail customers. Trial Staff emphasizes that Complainants' witness' conclusion that the instant contracts had macroeconomic impact on the California economy because of overcharges associated with the contracts was discredited when the Respondents' witnesses pointed out errors in the analysis and Complainants' witness concluded that, after correction, his analysis would not show that the contracts were priced above long-run competitive prices.

iii. *Sellers*

Sellers argue that Complainants have failed to show any viable quantification of the magnitude of the alleged impact of the dysfunctional ISO spot markets on the contracts at issue. Sellers note that Complainants only attempt to quantify this alleged impact was through the direct testimony of an expert which was flawed and when corrected suggested that the contracts were not adversely affected by the dysfunction because they did not exceed long-run competitive prices derived from estimates of long-run marginal costs. Sellers also argue that Complainants' downward adjustment version of the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark ignores the plain meaning of the Commission's order establishing that benchmark and has no credible justification. Finally, Sellers contest Complainants' experts misuse of the GE MAPS Modeling Data developed by Sellers' witness.

iv. *Allegheny*

Allegheny points out that its contract price of $61/MWh and $76/MWh (for peaking power) are well below the Commission's benchmark price of $74/MWh for round-the-clock power. Allegheny states that it relied upon the Commission's benchmark in its negotiations with CDWR. It notes that its agreement is below numerous other benchmarks as well, including CDWR's target price of $70/MWh for long-term contracts. It contends that because the Allegheny contract was priced at $61/MWh it gave the State the leeway to enter into higher priced contracts while

not causing the average price to exceed the $70/MWh target. It states that its Offer of Proof demonstrates that Allegheny's March 23, 2001, 11-year, long-term power contract was comparably priced to post-June 19, 2001 contracts and that its April 2001 short-term peaking power contract for power in 2003 was similarly priced even below post-June 19, 2001 contracts that contained similar terms and conditions.

v. *Coral*

Coral argues that the price of energy in the Coral Agreement when levelized over the life of the contract falls below the Commission's just and reasonable benchmark of $74/MWH. Coral contends that in formulating an adjusted benchmark Complainants' witnesses ignored most of the distinguishing characteristics of the Coral Agreement: its substantial seasonal shaping, the value to CDWR of 500 hours per year of dispatch control over the Wildflower Units, and the agreement becomes a tolling structure in 2006 through 2011. Coral claims that segmentation of the eleven-year contract term into two periods, a five-year term and a six-year term, in the adjusted formula does not produce a valid economic benchmark. It contends that the composite benchmark is equally illogical and produces a "heads-I-win-tails-you-lose" result for CDWR.

Coral claims that the prices in the Coral Agreement when levelized over the term of the contract fall below the long-run marginal cost of generation in California as measured by Complainants' own witness.

vi. *Dynegy*

Dynegy states that quantitative evidence demonstrates that the price in the Dynegy Agreement was driven by market fundamentals and did not Exhibit any material influence of spot market dysfunction. Dynegy claims that its price is below Complainants' forward curves used by Navigant Consulting during the negotiation of the long-term contracts as well as the average forward prices reflected in contemporaneous broker sheets.

Dynegy responds to Complainants' arguments regarding the analysis of GE Maps by noting that Complainants' witness testified that a $6/MWh capacity charge would fully compensate generators fo their fixed costs, thus, withdrawing criticism of a capacity adder and advocating a higher charge than that used by one of Sellers' experts. It also counters that Complainants' witnesses provide the elements needed to disprove Complainants unfounded reliance on Sellers' expert's GE MAPS results.

vii. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley contends that the long-run marginal cost of new generation is not relevant to the Morgan Stanley Agreement because, as a power marketer and price taker, Morgan Stanley's marginal cost of supplying power to CDWR is the offer side of Morgan Stanley's forward electricity price curve when the CDWR transaction was executed, not the long-run marginal cost of new generation. It asserts that the forward price curves produced by Navigant for CDWR are equal to, or higher than, the forward price curves that Morgan Stanley used to price its contract with CDWR.

Morgan Stanley claims that the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark does not apply to the Morgan Stanley Agreement because: (1) CDWR did not consider the benchmark when pricing the contract; (2) Morgan Stanley relied on forward market prices, not the benchmark, to determine a reasonable contract price; (3) the Commission did not intend for the benchmark to apply to a single contract; and (4) the Commission did not intend to establish a cost-based standard for market-based prices for long-term contracts. It adds that the adjustments to this benchmark appear to be an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission's December 15, 2001 Order.

viii. *Sempra*

Sempra argues that Complainants have failed to provide any evidence specifically addressing the Sempra Agreement. It claims that the rates, terms and conditions of

its contract are, and were acknowledge by CDWR and California officials to be, just and reasonable. It points out that the rates under the Sempra Agreement are just and reasonable when compared to the benchmarks used by Complainants, including an analysis of long-run competitive prices prepared by Complainants' witness.

b. *Reply Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants charge that Respondents have failed to explain the disparity between the forward prices and Dynegy's witness' fundamentals forecast. They state that Dynegy's witness did not claim, as Respondents state, that the disparity was due to scarcity rent, but rather could be explained by risk premium. They argue that their witness' testimony supports Dynegy's witness' analysis and use of capacity adders and Respondents' attempt to change the record should be unsuccessful.

Complainants argue that Dynegy's revised fundamentals forecast prices are false due to misleading ranges and use of a weighted average calculation. Complainants contend that even using Dynegy's adjustments, the 2003 fundamentals forecast is below the forward prices for almost every month. Complainants assert that, despite the inaccuracies of the recalculation by Dynegy, there is still a significant price gap that can only be explained as a dysfunction premium, not a scarcity rent.

Complainants aver that due to the huge disparities between the benchmark contract of $74/MWh and Respondents' prices, which are substantially higher, they have made a compelling showing that a Phase II proceeding is warranted. The benchmark evidence raises a strong presumption that some sellers were exercising market power, thereby raising a similar presumption that the markets were not competitive. Furthermore, Complainants argue that the benchmark was ambiguous and subject to refinement therefore Respondents have no "reliance interest" in their interpretation of the benchmark.

Additionally Complainants argue that any contracts exceeding five years should be compared to a benchmark that is extended on the basis of the Respondents' forward curves to ensure competitive prices. For any years beyond the first five, a benchmark of $74/MWh is not competitive, and should not be considered just and reasonable as Trial Staff argues.

Complainants assert that the benchmark applies to all sellers including power marketers based on underlying policy and prior Commission statements. While Morgan Stanley argues that the Commission did not intend for the benchmark to apply to power marketers, Complainants argue that at no point did the Commission imply that the benchmark only applied to suppliers owning existing generation equipment, nor did it exempt the contracts of power marketers when these issues were set for hearing. Additionally, applying the benchmark to power marketers is consistent with Commission policy objectives to contain prices. If the benchmark did not apply to power marketers in addition to other suppliers, generation owners would instead be insulated from the effects of the benchmark.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff argues that Complainants presented flawed arguments concerning the application of the Commission's $74/MWH benchmark to the contested contracts. Trial Staff asserts that, with respect to the contract-specific benchmark analyses presented by Complainants, Trial Staff does not believe that reference to the Commission's benchmark demonstrates that the rates in these contracts were adversely affected by the spot market dysfunctions. Trial Staff argues that the rates in these contracts merely reflect the parties' expectations regarding future spot market prices, and, as discussed in Trial Staff's Initial Brief, there has been no showing that those expected future spot market prices were driven by anything other than market fundamentals. Moreover, Trial Staff states that a number of the contracts fully satisfy the Commission's benchmark.

For example, Trial Staff points to one of Allegheny's contracts, an 11-year contract priced at $61/MWh providing both around-the-clock (7-by-24) and peaking power, that is well below the $74/MWh benchmark and should on that basis alone be deemed just and reasonable.

Trial Staff contest Complainants' contention that, notwithstanding the fact that no benchmark analysis was done on the Dynegy, Mirant and Sempra contracts, "it is fair to conclude that the prices in these contracts also exceed the benchmark." Trial Staff argues that such a conclusion must be rejected not only because it is completely unsupported and speculative but also because it erroneously places the ultimate burden of persuasion on the Respondents, contrary to law.

iii. *Allegheny*

Allegheny contests Complainants' contention that the Commission should use the Dynegy Agreement to "help put in perspective just how extraordinary these agreements are." Allegheny states that there is no basis for the Commission to adopt this one-size-fits-all approach to characterizing the contracts at issue in this proceeding because the Allegheny Agreement and circumstances in which it was negotiated were distinct from the Dynegy Agreement. For example, it notes that the Dynegy Agreement involves sales from a group of generating facilities that Dynegy purchased while Allegheny owns no plants. It points out that Complainants allege that they entered into the Dynegy Agreement because they "desperately needed the energy Dynegy was offering for the summer of 2001" while, because Allegheny owned or controlled no generation in the market, its entry into the market did not impact the quantity of supply available to the CDWR. It asserts that CDWR wanted to shift to Allegheny the costs and risks of purchasing at high prices and "borrow" money by using Allegheny effectively as a bank. Allegheny states that other differences with the Dynegy Agreement include the fact that: (1) Allegheny's

long-term contract with CDWR exceeds ten years, while the Dynegy contract is much shorter with a duration of three years; and (2) unlike Dynegy which structured a portion of its contract as a tolling arrangement with CDWR taking fuel risk, Allegheny assumed the full risk of fluctuating prices of natural gas in its contract.

Allegheny argues that the comparison to the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark shows that the Allegheny Agreement is *per se* just and reasonable, rather than that the Allegheny Agreement was affected by dysfunction. Allegheny challenges Complainants' contention that Allegheny's $61/MWh Agreement exceeds the benchmark even when $74/MWh is used for the first five years. Allegheny asserts that Complainants neglect to mention that the benchmark upon which these results are based is the "use the seller's forward curves" method for the period beyond five years which Trial Staff and Sellers' expert witnesses thoroughly discredited. Allegheny states that the figures cited by Complainants as the amounts by which the Allegheny Agreement "exceed the benchmark" are therefore meaningless and incorrect and that Complainants claim that these figures evidence effects of the dysfunctional spot market on forward markets is meritless. Further, Allegheny claims that Complainants' contention is surprising since their own pre-filed testimony shows, as confirmed by Dr. Pechman on cross-examination, that the first five years of the Allegheny $61/MWh rate is not only substantially lower than the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark but also lower than the lowest version of Complainants' "retooled" price adjusted and product-specific adjusted benchmark of $61.50. It notes that Trial Staff agrees that the Allegheny Agreement satisfies the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark. Thus, Allegheny believes that the comparison of the primary Allegheny Agreement, at $61/MWh, to Complainants' own projections of non-dysfunctional prices shows that the Allegheny Agreements produce significant savings, as opposed to

overcharges or "dysfunction premiums," as compared to the Commission's benchmark.

iv. *El Paso*

102. El Paso asserts that Complainants cannot adequately compare the El Paso Agreement with the $74/MWh benchmark. It contends that comparing the two ignores the extrinsic factors that justify the terms of the contract. El Paso argues that Complainants ignored the specific guidance of the Commission as to the legal effect of the benchmark: anything below the benchmark is just and reasonable. El Paso also argues that, in *San Diego Gas & Elec.*,[155] the Commission stated that buyers may elect to enter into contracts above the level of the benchmark provided the contract suits their needs. Based on this holding, El Paso avers that there is no justification for using the $74 benchmark. Even if the benchmark was a starting point used to measure the reasonableness of the El Paso Agreement, El Paso argues that it provided values other than price to CDWR, such as bearing additional default risk than is standard in order to assist California during its power crisis. El Paso contends that these additional non-price values should be taken into consideration as well.

v. *Mirant*

103. Mirant asserts that Complainants' request for an affirmative finding that the challenged contracts were adversely affected by dysfunction in the ISO spot markets by comparing four of those contracts to the Commission's $74/MWh advisory benchmark should be rejected. Mirant contests Complainants' argument that "margins by which these four contracts exceed the relevant benchmarks are so wide that it is only proper to conclude that the remaining contracts, Dynegy, Mirant and Sempra ... must also exceed the benchmark by some margin," noting that Complainants ask the Commission to presume that the Mirant Agreement

---

155 *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at p. 61,995 (2000).

would not compare favorably with the Commission's benchmark, if such an analysis were (or could be) done, and that contract modification is warranted as a result. Mirant notes that Complainants' expert witnesses never applied the benchmark to the Mirant Agreement. Mirant states that Complainants' expert conceded at hearing that the Commission's $74 MWh benchmark was developed as a guideline for contracts with a five-year term and could not readily be applied to the nineteen-month Mirant Agreement. Mirant asserts that the burden is on Complainants to show that the challenged contracts were adversely affected by spot market dysfunction and that, if Complainants believed that a benchmark comparison could establish that link, they should have provided that comparison as part of their affirmative case.

Mirant notes that it undertook its own benchmark analysis as part of its direct case. Mirant's expert witness compared the Mirant Agreement to three other CDWR power purchase agreements and found that the price in the Mirant Agreement was comparable to the prices in those contracts. Although Mirant's expert's testimony was stricken, Mirant points out that the ALJ allowed Mirant to submit the stricken testimony as an offer of proof. Mirant argues that, if the Commission agrees with Mirant that its expert's benchmark comparison should be taken into account, the case against modification of Mirant's Agreement becomes clearer because the analysis further demonstrates that the Mirant Agreement was not adversely affected in any manner by dysfunctions in the ISO spot markets. Mirant states that regardless of whether the Commission considers its expert's alternative benchmark analysis, it must disregard Complainants' assertion that the Commission should assume that the Mirant Agreement would fail any such benchmark comparison because Complainants' tactic is improper and is a request for a presumption based upon analyses that were never done.

vi. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley states that the difference between the $74/MWh benchmark and the Morgan Stanley contract price does not prove that Morgan Stanley included a dysfunctionality premium in the contract price.

vii. *Sempra*

Sempra states that the Sempra Agreement compare favorably to a variety of benchmarks. Sempra points out that while Complainants' witnesses decided against conducting an analysis of the Sempra Agreement, Sempra submitted a different kind of "benchmark" analysis in Sempra's direct case. Sempra states that its witness compared the rates in the Sempra Agreement against 14 long-term contracts that CDWR entered into after June 19, 2001 (when no party alleges that ISO spot markets were dysfunctional) and found the prices in the Sempra Agreement to be comparable, or in a number of instances, superior to prices in these 14 long-term contracts executed after June 19, 2001. As a result, its witness concluded that the Sempra Agreement was free from spot market dysfunctions. Sempra contends that, to the extent the Commission agrees to accept Sempra's Offer of Proof, it provides another piece of evidence showing that the Sempra Agreement should not be subject to abrogation or modification.

3. *Relative Bargaining Power*

a. *Initial Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants assert that the number of bids received in response to the RFBs is insignificant because all of the negotiations occurred above the inflated forward price curves. They claim that Respondents' contention that CDWR had options is further undercut because: (1) many of the bids were for less than 100 MWs when CDWR needed 12,000-15,000 MWs; (2) many of the offers started delivery after the summer of 2001; and (3) many of the sellers were unknown entities without experience in the power industry.

Complainants argue that, under the extraordinary circumstances in which CDWR was purchasing power, CDWR had essentially no bargaining power. They assert that Respondents have not explained and cannot explain why a purchaser with superior leverage would: (1) pay more, not less, than the sellers' forward price curves; (2) enter into contracts for 10 years when it needed 1-3 year contracts; and (3) agree to purchase large amounts of energy in the out years of the contracts with relatively small amounts delivered in the early years when the purchaser desperately needed the power.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff argues that the totality of purchases and the conditions present at the time the contracts were entered into do not justify contract modification. Trial Staff contends that CDWR, through the California Energy Resources Scheduling Division (CERS), procured a diversified portfolio of contracts which varied in terms of the products provided and length of the contract with a variety of suppliers and power companies at an average contract price over the May 2001 through December 2010 period below the $74/MWh benchmark established by the Commission. Trial Staff claims that the terms and conditions of the proposals made by CDWR and the processes and procedures CDWR used to evaluate the contracts were the result of decisions freely made by CDWR. Trial Staff asserts that CDWR's purchasing strategy was intended to, and did, shift considerable risk to the sellers such as the risk of rising natural gas costs and the lack of payment assurances. Trial Staff also contends that CDWR sought "a weighted average cost of long-term contract energy expected to be within the combined average cost of energy supply reflected in the IOU's retail rates, as of January 2001." Trial Staff notes that CDWR's purchasing strategy later changed when it became willing to accept "tolling" agreements. Trial Staff asserts that CDWR's primary goal was to achieve a diversity of supply sufficient

to cover the net short for the summer of 2001 at an average price not to exceed the $70/MWh benchmark established by those in charge of the negotiations with the objective of depriving the spot market of its volume and thus taming its out-of-control prices.

Trial Staff concludes that CDWR mostly succeeded in meeting its objectives: (1) forming a portfolio of short, intermediate and long-term contracts covering a variety of energy products (*e.g.*, 24-by-7 or baseload supply and 6-by-16 peaking service) at an average price that fell below the $70/MWh benchmark it had set; and (2) stabilizing the market by entering into long-term contracts. Trial Staff claims that CDWR did not have a formal process in place for reviewing or evaluating the contracts until mid-March 2001 which led to ill-advised decisions or choices. Trial Staff concludes that CDWR's RFBs and its purchasing strategies were the reason that CDWR may have purchased supply under contracts with longer terms than it would have liked. Trial Staff notes that CDWR issued RFBs in which the entire risk of the rising cost of gas was placed on the sellers, the sellers had no assurance that CDWR would meet its financial obligations and CDWR set its pricing goals significantly below the current market prices.

Trial Staff contends that, given the number of parties who were interested in selling power to the State of California on a long-term basis, CDWR had options and did not lack bargaining power due to the crisis that existed. Trial Staff argues that, in fact, it was the sellers who may have lacked alternatives, given the fact that CDWR was in essence "the sole purchaser" who controlled the information sellers had on the State's success in procuring adequate future supply. In response to CDWR's contention that these numbers are deceiving because many of the bids were less than 100 MW when CDWR needed 12,000-15,000 MW, many of the offers did not start deliveries until after the summer of 2001 and many of the sellers were unknown entities with no experience in the power industry, Trial Staff states that these arguments assume that the

referenced sellers were the only ones with whom CDWR was negotiating while the evidence presented indicates otherwise.

In response to CDWR's contention that it was not "the only game in town" due to sellers profitable alternative of selling their power in the dysfunctional, high priced spot market and the circumstances under which it was purchasing (*i.e.*, continuing Stage 3 alerts and its inability to continue purchasing in the high priced spot market), Trial Staff notes that CDWR's witness admitted that CDWR was "essentially a single purchaser," with an enormous demand that was not elastic, CDWR did not expect the high prices in the spot market to last beyond a year or two at most and CDWR and sellers knew that once CDWR began to procure long-term supplies it would have an adverse affect on the lucrative spot market. Trial Staff also notes that CDWR negotiated with sellers on an individual basis and controlled the information sellers had on its negotiations with other suppliers which affect sellers' ability to judge whether their offers would be accepted. Trial Staff notes that, even if CDWR lacked options or believed that it lacked options in these negotiations, sellers did not given that impression due to the situation and the press reports. Trial Staff also notes that, after executing the first few long-term contracts, CDWR gained negotiating leverage and could be more selective regarding prices and terms.

Trial Staff argues that contemporaneous statements made by CDWR and the Governor indicated that they fully supported the price, terms and conditions of these contracts at the time they were executed. Trial Staff notes that the CDWR witness who informed the public about CDWR's contracting efforts confirmed his press statement reported on April 20, 2001 that "[i]f the prices just get ridiculous altogether, there's a policy call to be made, and we'll cross that bridge when we get there."

Trial Staff provides a contract by contract review of the Dynegy, El Paso, Morgan Stanley and Sempra agreements to demonstrate that CDWR was not forced to accept

unreasonable rates, terms or conditions, but rather achieved its targeted objectives and willingly agreed to enter into these contracts.

iii. *Sellers*

Sellers state that the evidence demonstrates that CDWR established and achieved its long-term contract objectives: (1) CDWR established and achieved the objective of obtaining power at a portfolio average price of $70/MWh; and (2) CDWR established and achieved non-price objectives.

iv. *Allegheny*

Allegheny argues that it entered into arm's-length negotiations in good faith with CDWR at the solicitation of CDWR. Allegheny states that the terms of the solicitation and the contract were largely dictated by CDWR.

Allegheny notes that, by the time CDWR signed its contract with Allegheny late in the process, long-term agreements had been reached by CDWR with over 30 parties for more than 8,000 MW and CDWR had reached its goal of contracting for fifty percent of the "net short." Allegheny asserts that, by that time, CDWR was negotiating contract terms and conditions that were more beneficial to CDWR than the prior contracts.

Allegheny contends that it had little bargaining power because it sought to enter into a long-term contract in the western markets. Allegheny claims that CDWR made several key demands on Allegheny as a precondition to entering into a contract, including: (1) Allegheny would commence service beginning in March 2001 through the summer 2001 peak periods; (2) Allegheny would back load the contract and sell peak power to the State at a subsidized rate of $61/MWh (when peak prices were approaching $450/MWh); and (3) Allegheny would assume all market exposure to changes in electricity and gas prices. Allegheny states that it agreed to these conditions.

Allegheny asserts that CDWR asked Allegheny to commit to a performance obligation with CDWR, which

Allegheny describes as essentially a shell entity without assets, cash or credit, and that CDWR would not provide any guarantees from the State or any other creditworthy entity for CDWR's performance obligations.

Allegheny contends that CDWR had substantial bargaining leverage with Allegheny by virtue of the hundreds of offers in response to it solicitations and thousands of megawatts more offered outside the solicitation process. It asserts that CDWR kept the terms of these offers from Allegheny and that CDWR used this information in negotiations as leverage against Allegheny. Allegheny argues that CDWR had ample bargaining power and numerous options as illustrated by CDWR's insistence upon numerous unconventional contract terms, including agreeing to sell at a substantial loss in the initial period of the contract, which Allegheny states it had to accept.

Allegheny states that the contract prices were strictly based upon then-prevailing forward curves, not the current spot prices. It contends that it assumed all exposure to changes in market prices which was significant.

Allegheny states that it was required to and in fact hedged its obligations under the contract, including purchasing power at a loss in the high spot markets to honor its contract obligations to CDWR. It adds that it also entered into a long-term tolling arrangement in April 2001 at the height of the market dysfunctionality at a substantial cost to insure its performance for the entire contract term. Allegheny contends that both CDWR and Allegheny knew that Allegheny would be required to sell power to CDWR at a substantial loss in the early years, with the expectation that Allegheny would recoup such losses at the back-end of the contract. Allegheny states it incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in realized cash losses to date in honoring its obligations under the contract.

Allegheny asserts that CDWR set out to accomplish specific goals in procuring long-term power, including reducing its reliance on the spot market and providing a

secure and reliable long-term source of supply. Allegheny states that it helped CDWR accomplish these goals.

v. *Coral*

Coral argues that Complainants failed to prosecute two of their three complaints against the Coral Agreement. It notes that Complainants had alleged that three provisions were unjust and unreasonable and thus should be abrogated or modified: (1) Sec. 10.2(b) which subordinates CDWR's bond obligation to the payment to Coral for energy and capacity supplied to CDWR under the contract; (2) Sec. 3.10 which provides Coral with most-favored-nations rights with regard to credit, security and payment priority; and (3) Sec. 3.6 which adopts the March 16, 2001 fixed prices, as modified May 25, 2001, by CDWR for energy deliveries from May 24, 2001 to December 31, 2005.

Coral responds that it was CDWR who proposed both the bond subordination and most-favored-nations provisions, and Complainants did not present any evidence demonstrating that these provisions were unreasonable. It notes that Complainants Coral-specific evidence focused entirely on the third disputed provision regarding price.

vi. *Dynegy*

Dynegy points out that Complainants did not discuss the particular terms of the Dynegy Agreement either in its direct or rebuttal case. Dynegy argues that the Dynegy Agreement was a mutually beneficial agreement sought by both parties. It contends that CDWR had the resources of the State behind it, was advised by consultants, had choices and wielded significant leverage during the negotiations. It states that the length of the Dynegy Agreement was not controversial during the negotiations. It notes that the Dynegy Agreement is not back-end loaded: the pricing provisions for the firm (fixed-price) and contingent (tolling agreement) power do not change over the life of the contract and Complainants benefit from the reduction in natural gas prices. It asserts that Complainants have no basis for

complaining about the non-price provisions in the Dynegy Agreement.

vii. *El Paso*

El Paso contends that the El Paso Agreement arose out of an arms' length negotiation that required compromise on the part of each party to reach a mutually agreeable price term. El Paso states that, once CDWR indicated its unwillingness to enter into an agreement using standard industry credit protections, El Paso acquiesced and agreed to include CDWR's proposed terms, including its proposed "most-favored nation" clause (Section 3.10). It adds that it acquiesced to additional terms, most of which constitute the clauses that Complainants request be abrogated on the ground that they reflected unequal bargaining positions of the respective parties. It argues that CDWR had a savvy, experienced negotiating team and numerous options. It states that there is no evidence that CDWR was not content with the negotiation or the agreement reached. It contends that, to the extent CDWR operated under any limitations in its bargaining posture and in its choice to contract with a particular party, those limitations were self-imposed. It claims that, if CDWR had not been limited by the State's retail rate objectives and had acted over a longer timetable, California would have been able to take advantage of declining prices. It argues that CDWR and its advisors realized that El Paso had treated CDWR fairly in connection with the two 50 MW purchases because CDWR chose to pursue a follow-on contract with El Paso. It notes that during the negotiations CDWR representatives and the Governor gave assurances to El Paso that CDWR and California would perform their end of the deal.

viii. *Mirant*

Mirant argues that the only evidence in the record on the specific circumstances of the Mirant Agreement shows that Mirant did not exert any undue leverage in entering into this contract.

ix. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley argues that CDWR, not Morgan Stanley, had superior bargaining power in their contract negotiations.

x. *Sempra*

Sempra claims that the Sempra Agreement was the result of a lengthy negotiation process in which CDWR enjoyed significant bargaining power over Sempra and Sempra had few options available to it.

b. *Reply Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants argue that whether or not CDWR exercised or held bargaining leverage is not a factor to be considered in whether the resulting contracts are just and reasonable. They claim in any case that CDWR's contracts undermine any bargaining leverage argument as none of the contracts were priced below the forward curves. They assert also that Respondents had other options for power sales and it was their choice to remain in the spot market during a period of unprecedented pricing.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff contends that Complainants did not show that the bids CDWR received for power supply reflected continued expectations of dysfunction in the spot markets. Trial Staff notes that, according to Complainants, the fact that CDWR had to accept contract terms that it was not content with supports their claim that CDWR did not have superior leverage in the negotiations. However, Trial Staff argues that Complainants fail to mention that in order for CDWR to meet its purchasing objective of keeping the average price of its portfolio at or below $70/MWh, CDWR was going to have to accept longer term contracts with a levelized price, regardless of the leverage it may or may not have had at the bargaining table. Trial Staff argues that this price target combined with the fixed-price contracts CDWR was seeking had an impact on the type of offers that

CDWR was receiving in response to its RFBs. Trial Staff notes that Complainants contend that the offers that CDWR received did not come close to the amount of energy needed to make it through the summer of 2001; in support, Complainants refer to Exhibit CAL-157 which reflects the bids CDWR received in response to the two RFBs. Trial Staff argues that Exhibit CAL-157 does not tell the real story because it does not include the offers CDWR was receiving from suppliers outside of the RFB process—offers that were for significant amounts of energy.

iii. *Allegheny*

Allegheny points out that Complainants have dropped the contention raised in its Complaint that the contracts contained "onerous," non-price terms which justified abrogating or modifying the contracts. It notes that Complainants concedes that these terms were "the product of negotiations" between the parties and that, "in some cases, CDWR was able to negotiate on material terms, including price." Allegheny asserts that, at hearing, Complainants elected not to put on a fact witness to contest Mr. Koenig's testimony that many of the key terms in the Allegheny contract, including those relating to price and duration, were driven by the CDWR. Allegheny argues that this was not surprising given the numerous contracts rejected by CDWR on the basis of price, (including rejecting Allegheny's initial offers) and CDWR ability to impose "dealbreaker" ultimatums on Allegheny. Allegheny states that CDWR's abandonment of its claims with respect to non-price terms, coupled with Mr. Koenig's unrebutted testimony regarding price negotiations, compels a finding that Sellers did not have bargaining power over CDWR in the forward bilateral markets with respect to both price and non-price terms.

Allegheny states that Complainants misstate the record regarding CDWR's negotiating position with Allegheny and that the CDWR received valuable and significant megawatts from Allegheny in the front end of the contract

and could have received more. First, it asserts that the Allegheny $61/MWh Agreement provides for 750 MW of 6x16 peaking power from April 1,2001 to June 30, 2001 and 250 MW of 6x16 peaking energy from July 1,2001 to September 30,2001 at a subsidized, fixed price despite tight supply conditions and the high volatility in the market. Second, Allegheny states that it made numerous offers in response to CDWR's RFBs, many of which CDWR rejected or changed to suit its needs.

Allegheny also argues that Complainants fail to address the evidence demonstrating that CDWR had ample bargaining power and achieved its objective. In response to Complainants' claims that the responses to the RFBs, which separately provided bids for approximately 13,000 and 16,000 MWs, respectively, would have given CDWR "at most about 5,000 MW under contract for the summer of 2001, about one third of the projected peak net short energy demand," Allegheny argues that Complainants provide no evidence that CDWR did not or could not negotiate with the bidders about providing power in the summer of 2001 or earlier. Allegheny avers that CDWR used its considerable leverage to get Allegheny to supply peaking power in the spring and summer of 2001, after Allegheny proposed to provide power beginning in October 2001. Allegheny argues that Complainants assume that CDWR negotiated only with the sellers that provided further responses to the RFBs, but note that, to the contrary, CDWR's internal documents demonstrate that CDWR negotiated and contracted with many other sellers outside of the RFB process. Allegheny claims that not once in Complainants' Initial Brief do they mention that CDWR rejected at least 45 proposed contracts, involving thousands of megawatts, more than half of which were rejected because of the price terms. Allegheny asserts that rejection of these proposed contracts "came in various stages of negotiations" and that CDWR rejected some proposals "almost immediately on the initial price offering."

iv. *Dynegy*

Despite worries about the State's creditworthiness, Dynegy states that it entered into short-term contracts in an effort to assist the State with its energy crisis during on-going contract negotiations. Dynegy asserts that throughout these negotiations the State threatened to use the Governor's office as well as the media as leverage, backed out of deals, and demanded renegotiation.

Dynegy argues that the State's claim of uneven bargaining power is misplaced. According to Dynegy, the State uses an inaccurate profit estimate as proof that Dynegy had uneven bargaining power that Dynegy used to compel the State to accept prices that contained spot market dysfunction premiums. Dynegy responds that its contract helped the State meet important goals. Dynegy states that the Dynegy Agreement was for a short-term, the contract prices were under the forward curves at the time the contract was made, and the agreement did not backload capacity, instead making 1000 MW immediately available. Dynegy concludes that the State's complaints about contracts with Sellers do not apply to the Dynegy Agreement.

Dynegy contends that the State knew what it was bargaining for with Dynegy and obtained what it wanted through its negotiations with Dynegy. According to Dynegy, the result was short, medium and long-term contracts with an average price of $70/MWh. Dynegy asserts that the State was content with its bargain but now reaches a different conclusion.

v. *El Paso*

According to El Paso, testimony shows that prices were mutually agreed upon and were negotiated at arms' length.

vi. *Mirant*

Mirant asserts that Complainants have mischaracterized the facts in an effort to show undue bargaining strength on the part of Mirant. Mirant states that when these distortions are eliminated and the context is understood, it

is clear that Mirant did not have superior bargaining strength in its negotiations with CDWR, and, if anything, the evidence shows that CDWR may have had superior leverage given its status as the biggest (and virtually the only) creditworthy purchaser in California. Mirant states that, contrary to Complainants' position that Mirant was seeking to avoid a long-term deal and focus on alleged higher profits in the short-term market, Mirant actually refrained from making a shorter-term deal pending completion of its May negotiations with CDWR.

vii. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley asserts that Complainants have not proven, and cannot prove, that Morgan Stanley exercised superior bargaining power in negotiating its contract with CDWR. It contends that the rate, terms and conditions in the contract reflect the outcome of arm's-length negotiation between sophisticated market participants and, if anything, the record evidence shows that CDWR, rather than Morgan Stanley, had the superior bargaining power in the contract negotiations.

viii. *Sempra*

Sempra asserts that CDWR had bargaining leverage over Sempra because CDWR was "the only game in town" for purposes of securing a long-term contract of the magnitude that could be used to support the significant amounts of generation that Sempra wished to develop in and around California, while CDWR had a broad variety of sellers willing to make sales to it and had secured a large percentage of the power it wished to have under contract prior to the execution of the Sempra Agreement. Sempra also states that Trial Staff confirmed that, by the time the Sempra Agreement was executed, CDWR had significant bargaining power over potential suppliers and that as early as February 2001, a CDWR negotiator felt that CDWR had the ability to tell a potential supplier to "take a hike" and that it "only stands to reason that once CDWR executed the first few long-term contracts, it gained greater negotiating

leverage and could be more selective as to what prices and terms it would accept."

Sempra contends that it made repeated concessions to CDWR throughout the negotiation process, including modifications to Sempra's initial bids that resulted in Sempra making sales to CDWR during the summer of 2001 at below-market rates, reducing the amounts of baseload energy that Sempra would provide to CDWR and taking on transmission risks that would ordinarily be allocated to the buyer. Sempra states that, although Complainants now claims that CDWR did not want large amounts of power in the later years, a review of Sempra's initial bids reveals that Sempra had offered CDWR the option of having Sempra provide smaller amounts of power, over a shorter period, than the parties eventually agreed to in the executed Sempra Agreement.

Sempra argues that, contrary to Complainants' claim that ISO spot market dysfunctions forced CDWR to enter into contracts with the Sellers, CDWR was under no obligation to enter into any long-term contracts in order to satisfy its obligations under California law, much less the ten plus year Sempra Agreement, and, indeed, CDWR was not legally obligated to purchase power under contracts of any duration. Further, Sempra claims that the record evidence demonstrates that, even to the extent CDWR believed it was compelled to purchase power, its need was only for near-term purchases for the summer of 2001. Moreover, it contends that record evidence demonstrates that CDWR sought to enter into long-term contracts with market participants such as Sempra to encourage the entry of new generation, a goal separate and apart from any need to acquire near-term supplies.

4. *Equities of Modification or Abrogation*

a. *Initial Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants assert that contract reformation here would not impede the making of contracts in the normal

course. They argue that sellers would know that, absent a declared market dysfunction which they would be aware of, their contracts would not be reformed. They state that, even in such circumstances, sellers would know that sellers would recover a healthy rate of return even if reformation were ordered. They contend that, if no remedy is available in these circumstances and another crisis occurs, the public would be loathe to enter into forward contracts for which no remedy would be available. They assert that the public would opt instead to stay in spot markets and seek refunds. They conclude that for these reasons the denial of a remedy here would deter forward buying precisely when it is otherwise desirable.

ii. *Trial Staff*

Trial Staff notes that contract modification may have an adverse impact on the efficient operation of the power market, on investment in new generation and on the willingness of market participants to enter into long-term contracts in the future. Trial Staff points out that any increase in prices associated with the potential regulatory risk of abrogation or modification of contracts will eventually be borne by customers in the form of higher energy costs. Trial Staff argues that the issue of investor confidence is of utmost concern and that contract abrogation or modification should not be permitted, therefore, unless a sufficient showing has been made that such an extraordinary remedy is required given the adverse affect such action could have on investor confidence in the industry.

iii. *Sellers*

Sellers argue that Complainants have not shown that the contracts place an excessive burden on customers. Sellers argue that sound policy demands that the sanctity of these contracts be affirmed. Sellers request that the Commission discourage other states from pursuing California's restructuring initiatives. Sellers assert that the abrogation or modification of the contracts at issue will

discourage forward contracting and defeat the solution that the Commission prescribed for California's energy crisis. Sellers point out that, if it grants the complaint, the Commission will discourage needed investment in generation.

iv. *Allegheny*

Allegheny concludes that Complainants failed to meet their burden of proof that Allegheny's contract was contrary to the public interest or even that modification would be appropriate under the lower burden "just and reasonable" standard. It states that by contrast it has demonstrated that it would be substantially financially harmed if the agreement were abrogated. It argues that the Commission should not modify or abrogate the instant contracts but rather affirm the sanctity of the instant contracts.

v. *Mirant*

Mirant contends that Complainants have failed to provide evidence that would support abrogation or modification of the Mirant Agreement under the "public interest" standard. Mirant argues that Complainants have not shown that the challenged contracts impose any burden on customers, did not attempt to argue that the Mirant Agreement is contrary to the public interest based upon a comparison with the Commission's $74/MWh. Mirant asserts that Complainants have not offered any credible evidence to counter Mirant's testimony on the specific and immediate detrimental effects of contract abrogation, as demonstrated by the current statements and reports of ratings agencies.

vi. *Morgan Stanley*

Morgan Stanley argues that Complainants did not offer any evidence that the Morgan Stanley Agreement itself will impact CDWR's financial ability to continue service, constitutes an excessive burden on other CDWR wholesale customers, or is unduly discriminatory against other CDWR wholesale customers. It contends that the Morgan Stanley's Agreement to supply 50 MWh of forward wholesale power

amounts to a mere fraction of the power CDWR contracted for to serve California during the relevant period and could not have any material impact on CDWR's financial ability to continue service, constitute an excessive burden on wholesale customers or unduly discriminate against wholesale customers.

Morgan Stanley argues that abrogation of the Morgan Stanley Agreement or substitution of the $74/MWh benchmark as requested by Complainants would cause Morgan Stanley significant losses. It states that, if the contract is modified, Morgan Stanley will be less willing to enter into forward wholesale electricity contracts in the future and prices in any such contract would include a risk premium to protect Morgan Stanley and its shareholders from increased regulatory risk. Additionally, it claims that such an action would not be in the public interest because it would not promote the Commission's goal of a viable competitive wholesale power market.

vii. *Sempra*

Sempra notes that the Sempra Agreement provides incentives for the construction of new generation which will directly benefit California and its customers but places Sempra at risk because the generation is unlikely to be profitable under current spot market and current expected future spot market prices. Sempra states that abrogation of the Sempra Agreement would be disastrous for Sempra in terms of its ability to develop and construct new generation and may result in the company ceasing to exist.

b. *Reply Briefs*

i. *Complainants*

Complainants argue that they have shown that the public will bear unjust and unreasonable rates and that the public interest in competitive markets is threatened by allowing Respondents' exploitation of the spot market dysfunction in order to reap windfall profits in the forward markets. Complainants contend that the public should not have to bear the dysfunctional future spot market rates that

the Commission has determined they should not bear for spot market purchases from October 2, 2000 through June 20, 2001 merely because the rates are embedded in long-term contract prices. Moreover, the public interest in restoring confidence in the electric industry and avoiding the creation of uneconomic demand-side incentives should outweigh the regulatory risk to the sellers. Complainants further argue that because the sellers' market-based rate authority is regulated by the Commission, sellers were aware of the likelihood that, once the market was no longer competitive, they would have to justify their contract rates.

Complainants state that contracts that are the product of arm's-length negotiation between discriminating buyers and sellers in a competitive marketplace should naturally fall under the "sanctity of contracts" and be upheld. They assert, however, that such is not the case in the instant matter. Here, high forward contract prices for delivery of power greatly exceeded prices that would result from a normally functioning competitive future spot market. Thus, the public should not be burdened with rates based on expected noncompetitive market conditions. In response to Respondents' challenge that reforming the contracts could cause future buyers and sellers to determine that contracts are not safe from hindsight modification, Complainants answer that argument by suggesting that the Commission explicitly state the reasons for any contract modification that might take place in these circumstances, stating that regulatory risk through modification of power purchase agreements has always been part of the electricity market landscape.

Complainants contend that failing to reform these contracts under these extraordinary circumstances will create disincentives for future buyers to enter into forward contracts because they will lose the possibility of refunds for spot market purchases. They state that, if the contract prices reflect an expectation that the spot market dysfunctions would inflate prices over competitive levels for 2001, 2002 and 2003, then public policy dictates that the

Commission alleviate the burden of those prices on the public.

ii. *Sellers*

Sellers argue that the State has wrongly attempted to use its own flawed policies on market restructuring as a reason for relieving the State of its contractual obligations to Sellers. Sellers contend that modifying the CDWR contracts will signal that the Commission will protect states from their own mistakes, such as implementing fundamentally flawed restructuring plans, even to the extent of modifying freely negotiated commercial contracts. In short, Sellers maintain that the State should take responsibility for its own errors, especially regarding retail matters over which the Commission has little, if no, jurisdiction.

iii. *Dynegy*

Dynegy argues that to allow the contract to be rewritten would send a negative message to market participants who might refuse to negotiate the next time markets are tight.

iv. *Sempra*

Sempra also avers that the State fails to justify the abrogation or modification of the Sempra Agreement under either the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard or the "just and reasonable" standard. First, it contends that the State fails to provide any direct evidence showing the Sempra Agreement to be unjust and unreasonable and instead attempts to attack the Sempra Agreement based solely on flawed and invalid comparisons. It claims that Complainants do not provide accurate information on the Sempra Agreement because, for example, the price in the Sempra Agreement is linked to a gas index price for the period from June 1, 2003 through September 30, 2011, rather than through September 30, 2003, as Complainants claims. In addition, the price for power provided on a 6x16 basis under the Sempra Agreement during the gas index price period is not "$3 l/MWh + (gas index x 10,500)" as Complainants represents. Thus, it argues that

Complainants mistakes a key element of the pricing provisions of the Sempra Agreement: the heat rate for 6x16 power.

Sempra states that there is also no value in Complainants' comparison of the Sempra Agreement to the Dynegy and Coral Agreements. It notes that the Dynegy contract is a three and a half year contract under which Dynegy will supply power to CDWR from existing generation resources. In contrast, it points out that the Sempra Agreement has a term of more than ten years and is structured with the intent of allowing Sempra to develop and construct new generation sufficient to meet its delivery obligations under the Sempra Agreement. As for the Coral Agreement, it claims that Complainants' witnesses admitted that the Coral Agreement and the Sempra Agreement were dissimilar, and, in rebuttal testimony, they "evaluated the ... Coral contract[], taking into account the peculiarities of product mix and contract duration" in order to contrast rates in the Coral Agreement to the Commission's $74/MWh benchmark." However, Sempra notes that the witnesses testified that they could not undertake a similar evaluation of the Sempra Agreement because the Sempra Agreement was "just too far from the paradigm to permit any meaningful comparison."

Pat WOOD, III, Chairman, *concurring in part*:

In voting on this order, I do not agree with the ALJ's interpretation that the case law is now clear that where a contract fails to specifically provide that the contract may be unilaterally altered, Mobile-Sierra automatically requires that proposed changes to the contract meet the "public interest" standard of review. *See* Partial Initial Decision at P 28. I concur in the conclusion that the public interest standard of review applies to the contracts at issue in this case based solely on the specific evidence surrounding execution of those contracts and the parties' intent.

William L. MASSEY, Commissioner, *dissenting*:

I am dissenting from this order, not because I relish abrogating contracts because I do not, but because I believe this Commission has a higher calling than simply the sanctification of long term contracts with prices reaching as high as $290 per MWh, contract prices that were multiples of traditional prices, shockingly high prices, completely unprecedented by historic standards. Our primary calling under the Federal Power Act is to ensure that prices are just and reasonable 24 hours a day, seven days a week. When prices soar to unprecedented levels, when prices exceed a just and reasonable level by multiples, we have the obligation to make it right. That is the way I read the law.

Many of the contracts challenged here provide for prices that are unlawful by any reasonable measure, and there is no persuasive public interest rationale for sanctifying contracts negotiated during the height of the Western electricity crisis, where the skyrocketing prices in an out of control spot market in California strongly influenced long term contract prices, wildly dysfunctional market conditions clearly allowed for the exercise of market power, and there was "epidemic" manipulation of the market according to our staff's Western Markets Report.

Protecting contracts entered into in this horribly tainted environment violates the Federal Power Act's forceful declaration that contracts are absolutely unlawful and must be reformed if not just and reasonable. Turning Commission policy on its head, today's order will encourage wholesale electricity purchasers to "ride the spot market" because the Commission has shown a willingness to mitigate, and provide refund protection from, unjust and unreasonable spot market prices, at least in the California spot markets.[1] By the same token, buyers will be discouraged from forward contracting because they will not enjoy protection from

---

[1] In a case decided today, the Commission denies refund protection to spot market buyers in the Pacific Northwest during the crisis period. *Puget Sound Energy, Inc.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,348 (2003).

unlawful contract prices. Power buyers, consumers and retail policymakers will lose faith in the concept of wholesale electricity markets if they cannot trust the Commission to protect them from unjust and unreasonable contract terms resulting from a wildly dysfunctional market, market power and epidemic market manipulation.

The J&R Standard Is the Appropriate Standard of Review in this Instance

One of the fundamental questions that must be addressed in evaluating whether a contract must be reformed is the standard of review. Where there is clear language in the contract indicating that the parties intended that the "public interest" standard must be met before terms may be modified, then that is the appropriate standard. Where the contract lacks a clear statement of intent, the correct standard to apply is not that clear. Today's order finds that the more stringent public interest standard must be satisfied even for contracts with no clear statement of intent. I do not agree.

It is my view that except where the contract has a *Mobile-Sierra* clause restricting the right of the buyer to file a Section 206 complaint, the just and reasonable standard applies. I concede that the law in this area is not the model of clarity, and the argument that the public interest standard controls is not without merit. Nevertheless, I believe a customer's waiver of Section 206 just and reasonable rights must be explicit. As the Commission observed in Order 888-A:

> We note that the fact that a contract may bind a utility to a Mobile-Sierra public interest standard does not necessarily mean that the customer is also bound to that standard. Unless a customer specifically waives its

Section 206 just and reasonable rights, the Commission construes the issue in favor of the customer.[2]

The Commission's proposed policy statement on standard of review is consistent with that position. The Commission would apply the just and reasonable standard of review unless specific language to the contrary is concluded in the contract.[3]

Perhaps more important, the just and reasonable standard should control the review of contracts negotiated *in the circumstances of this case* where the sellers were acting under a market-based pricing authorization granted by the Commission. The *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine arose in a cost-of-service regime. Once approved by the Commission as just and reasonable, a contract, rate or classification should not be modified unless a higher standard justifies the modification. This makes sense. Most cases arose in the context of a seller making a filing to justify a higher rate. In such a case, the doctrine appeared to have a customer protection rationale.

Today's order states that in a market based regime, the Commission's authorization for a public utility to sell at prices set by the discipline of the market, based upon a finding that the seller cannot exercise or has mitigated market power, amounts to a "predetermination" that any contract negotiated by such seller is just and reasonable. Hence, according to the majority, the just and reasonable standard of Section 205 is satisfied, and a later contract modification would have to be justified by the higher public interest standard.

There are three flaws in this logic as applied here. First, virtually all of the Commission's orders granting market

---

[2] Order No. 888-A, *FERC Statutes and Regulations, Regulations Preambles July 1996-December 2000* ¶ 31,048, p. at 30,191, footnote 31 (1997).

[3] *Standard of Review for Proposed Changes to Market-Based Rate Contracts for Wholesale Sales of Electric Energy by Public Utilities*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,145 at P7 (2002).

based pricing authority to the public utility sellers in the West explicitly declared that the Commission's action could not be construed as approving any contract negotiated pursuant thereto. These orders say:

> (t)his action does not constitute approval of any service, rate, charge, classification ... or any ... contract ... affecting such rate or service ..., nor shall such action be deemed as recognition of any claimed contractual right or obligation affecting or relating to such service or rate; and such action is without prejudice to any findings or orders which have been or may hereafter be made by the Commission in any proceeding ...

Based upon this language, it seems clear that these contracts have never been approved as just and reasonable under Section 205.

Second, even ignoring the rather plain language of the above-quoted paragraph, any possible presumption of the justness and reasonableness of contracts negotiated pursuant to the blanket authorization was flatly contradicted by the conclusions reached in the Commission's November 1, 2000 and December 15, 2000 orders, and in the July 2001 order requiring refunds. The November order found the market in California to be seriously flawed, and market conditions "have caused and continue to have the potential to cause, unjust and unreasonable rates for short term energy." Further: "There is clear evidence that the California market structure and rules provide the opportunity to exercise market power when supply is tight and can result in unjust and unreasonable rates."[4] In the December 15 order the Commission said that "we reaffirm our findings that unjust and unreasonable rates were charged and could continue to be charged, unless remedies

---

[4] *San Diego Gas & Electric Company*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,121, at p. 61,349 (2000).

are implemented."[5] It should be clear from both the breathtaking rise in prices after the December order and the June 2001 intervention by the Commission that the remedies in the December order did not work. Effective remedies were not put in place until June 2001 when the Commission imposed full time price controls. I would also note that the Commission's grant of market based pricing authority "depends on a functioning competitive market ... unimpaired by market manipulation." Implicit in the grant of such authority is "a presumption that a company's behavior will not involve fraud or deception."[6] Circumstances indicate that this condition and presumption were not fulfilled. The Commission has found evidence of market manipulation in the California markets and is also investigating whether sellers withheld power from the market or engaged in excessive bidding.

In light of all of these circumstances, the predetermination rationale is without merit. The Commission's July 2001 Order granting refunds for a nine month period beginning October 2, 2000 and ending June 19, 2001 was based upon a finding that during such period spot prices were not just and reasonable. It defies logic to rely upon a "predetermination" of justness and reasonableness contradicted by later Commission orders that reviewed real market conditions, found the opportunity to exercise market power, and required several billions of dollars in refunds based upon the explicit conclusion that actual prices charged in fact were not just and reasonable.

Third, the rates charged by sellers in the California spot markets were under the same regulatory scheme that produced the forward contracts at issue here, *i.e.*, a preliminary finding at the certificate stage that a seller

---

[5] *San Diego Gas & Electric Company*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294, at p. 61,999 (2000).

[6] *Reliant Energy Services, et al*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,315 at P 12 (2003); and *Enron Power Marketing Inc., et al.*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,316 (2003).

lacked or had mitigated market power and, hence, rates sought to be charged by such seller would by definition be just and reasonable. This "predetermination" applied equally to spot prices and to long term contract prices. Yet, in July 2001 the Commission wisely and correctly decided to apply the just and reasonable standard to justify modifying the California spot prices and ordering refunds. Satisfying the public interest standard was not required. The Commission did not protect unjust and unreasonable spot prices (which were derived under tariff conditions and are akin to hourly contracts), yet decides today to protect unjust and unreasonable longer term transactions negotiated under the same regulatory framework. This distinction in the standard of review, based solely upon the length of the transaction, does not comply with Sections 205 and 206 of the Act, and in my view is not reasoned decision making.

There is an additional reason that the just and reasonable standard should govern in this case. It is obvious that the buyers detrimentally relied upon the Commission's admonition in the December 2000 Order that market participants enter into long term contracts.[7] In that same order, the Commission assured buyers that they would be protected from the exercise of market power. The Commission set a $74 MWh benchmark to use "in assessing any complaints regarding the justness and reasonableness of pricing of such long-term contracts negotiated under current market conditions."[8] The Commission promised to monitor prices "to address concerns about potentially unjust and unreasonable rates" in the long term markets.[9]

---

[7] "... those who remain in the spot market for buying their residual load or selling their residual supply should be there in full recognition of the effects on price of last minute sales and purchases." 93 FERC at p. 61,996.

[8] 93 FERC at p. 61,982.

[9] 93 FERC at p. 61,994.

The buyers reasonably relied upon the Commission's declaration that complaints about long term contracts would be judged according to just and reasonable standards and they would be protected. Given that reliance, it is simply unfair to adopt a standard of review today that gives these buyers substantially less protection. In addition, after the Commission declared in December 2000 that $74 MWh was a just and reasonable benchmark for long term contracts negotiated thereafter, it seems unconscionable now to validate contracts that allowed sellers to fetch upwards of $250 MWh, $260 MWh, and $290 MWh—multiples of the benchmark. The Commission effectively said to buyers "get into long term contracts, $74 is a reasonable benchmark price and, hey, don't worry, we'll protect you from unjust and unreasonable contract prices." Today's order utterly fails to keep that commitment.

The Nexus Between the California Spot Market and the Forward Contract Market

A second fundamental issue in this case is whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets. I frankly do not understand why the hearing order in this case treated this as an open issue, and I said so at the time. The relationship between the spot market prices and long term contract prices seems rather obvious, and the Commission has explicitly recognized that "maintaining an accurately priced spot market is the single most important element for disciplining longer term transactions."[10] In our Standard Market Design proposal, the Commission found that:

> Bilateral contracts generally reflect buyer and seller expectations of prices in spot markets. Therefore, market power mitigation in the organized spot market

---

10 *AEP Power Marketing*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,219, at p. 61,972 (2001).

will effectively discipline market power in the bilateral markets as well [footnote omitted].[11]

More to the point, the Commission has specifically recognized the relationship between the California spot markets and bilateral markets in the West. Our November 1, 2000 Order stated:

> Therefore, the operation of the California electricity market can affect prices throughout the entire Western Interconnection. The Staff Report demonstrates that during the summer of 2000 correlations between PX prices and Western bilateral prices were quite strong.[12]

And our June 19, 2001 mitigation order recognizes that "(t)here is a critical interdependence among the prices in the ISO's organized spot markets, the prices in the bilateral spot markets in California and the rest of the West, and the prices in forward markets."[13] Thus, it is beyond comprehension why there is any doubt on this issue.

But if there was any doubt whatsoever regarding whether there was a nexus between the spot and forward markets, the staff's Western Markets Report should dispel it. Staff's analysis found that there was a statistically significant relationship between spot and forward power prices during the period January 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001.[14] The contracts at issue here were negotiated during this time period. The Commission should respect staff's analysis. It was performed by a nationally recognized econometrician with a specialty in energy futures markets and with access to the most comprehensive database of forward power contracts for the period and locations in question. Thus, based on logic, the Commission's prior

---

11 *Standard Market Design NOPR*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,138 at P 405 (2002).

12 93 FERC at pp. 61,357-358.

13 *San Diego Gas & Electric Company*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418, at p. 62,547 (2001).

14 Western Markets Report at VI-18.

statements, and the conclusions of our staff's strong analysis, it is beyond dispute that the prices and other terms of the forward contracts at issue here were influenced by the California spot markets.

The Just and Reasonable Standard is Met

The prices and other terms of the forward contracts at issue here are unjust and unreasonable and should be reformed. I base this conclusion on three factors. First, the Commission has found that the California spot markets resulted in unjust and unreasonable rates for the refund period (October 2, 2000 to June 19, 2001). This is the period during which the contracts at issue here were negotiated. Second, the California markets were subjected to various forms of manipulation, which may have included withholding.[15] Third, there was a clear nexus between the California spot market and the forward contract markets. The unlawful California spot prices strongly influenced forward contract prices. And fourth, the prices in many of these contracts are multiples of the $74 MWh price the Commission had declared would be used as a rough just and reasonable benchmark.

The Public Interest Standard is Met

Even if the majority is correct and the appropriate standard of review is the public interest standard, these agreements still do not withstand scrutiny and must be reformed. The tone of today's order is that the *Mobile-Sierra* line of cases places a thumb heavily on the scale in favor of sanctity of contracts, and thus sets an exceptionally

---

15 *See Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,343 (2003) where the Commission revokes the market-based authorities and terminates the blanket marketing certificates of various Enron affiliates. *See also, American Electric Power Service Companies, et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,345 (2003), *Enron Power Marketing, Inc. et al.* (2003) and *Investigation of Anomalous Bidding Behavior and Practices in the Western Markets*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,347 (2003) where the Commission establishes proceedings to investigate manipulative and questionable bidding behavior.

high threshold in meeting the public interest standard. While the threshold may be high, it is not as high as today's order would place it for the particular contracts at issue.

The *Mobile-Sierra* case law involves contracts negotiated under a cost-of-service regime, and thus we do not know how the courts would instruct the Commission to address contracts negotiated in a market-based regime, especially under market conditions characterized by dysfunctional market rules, widespread manipulative conduct, and a lack of effective regulatory oversight. We are on new ground here, and the Commission is free to decide what circumstances give rise to the public interest.[16] We are clearly not limited to the traditional three-prong test that gets so much attention. Today's order as well as court precedent point out that those three factors are only examples of what to consider in determining the public interest.[17] Indeed, the Commission has great discretion in carrying out its statutory responsibilities, even where the public interest standard controls:

> ... even if contracts fall within the scope of the Mobile-Sierra decisions, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the relevant agency, here FERC, may always reform a contract found to be 'unlawful' or 'contrary to the public interest,' *i.e.*, that "contracts remain fully subject to the paramount power of the Commission to modify them when necessary in the public interest."[18]

---

16 "... nowhere in the Supreme Court opinion is the term 'public interest' defined. Indeed, the Court seems to assume that the Commission decides what circumstances give rise to the public interest." *Northeast Utilities Service Company v. FERC*, 55 F.3d 686, 690 (1st Circuit 1995).

17 "This definition of what is necessary in the public interest was formulated in the context of a low-rate case. It was not and could not be an across-the-board definition of what constitutes the public interest in other types of cases." *Northeast Utilities*, 55 F.3d at 690. *Also see*, today's order at P 5.

18 *Northeast Utilities*, 55 F.3d at 693.

The Commission's order setting this case for hearing implicitly recognized our discretion in evaluating these contracts under the public interest standard when it held that "the Commission will not modify market based contracts unless there are extraordinary circumstances."[19] We are instructed by the courts that "(w)hen there is no reason to question what occurred at the contract formation stage, the parties may be required to live with their bargains."[20] What's at issue then is rendering judgement regarding whether there were extraordinary circumstances at play during the contract formation stage that warrant contract reformation.

In evaluating whether to reform contracts involving a seller with market-based authority, we must be guided by the market circumstances that affected the negotiations and contract terms. It has already been established that the conditions in the California markets infected markets across the West, including the forward contracts, such as those at issue in this case. What were the circumstances under which buyers negotiated these contracts?

- The structure and rules of California markets were flawed, market power could be exercised in them, unjust and unreasonable rates had been charged and the potential existed that unlawful rates could be charged in the future. This is what the Commission found in November and December of 2000.
- Due to a combination of factors, there was a shortage of electricity that resulted in unprecedented, high, volatile, and unjust and unreasonable prices in the spot markets. As a result, the Commission admonished buyers to move

---

19 *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087, at p. 61,383 (2002).

20 *Town of Norwood v. FERC*, 587 F.2d 1306, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

load into forward contracts or suffer the consequences.

- The electricity market during this same time frame was manipulated through a number of strategies by sellers. These are documented in the Western Markets Report and in orders decided today where the Commission requires more than fifty power sellers to defend against charges that they engaged in one or more manipulative strategies to pump up electricity prices.[21] The Commission is still investigating whether generation was strategically withheld from the market.
- During this same time frame, the price of natural gas, the fuel input for the marginal generation resources in the West, was manipulated by epidemic false reporting. This is documented in the Western Markets Report.
- As prices soared out of control, buyers had no basis to expect that this Commission would act forcefully to control them. The measures imposed in the December 2000 Order were clearly ineffective and prices continued to rise. The Commission approved as just and reasonable spot prices of $273 MWh, $430 MWh and $300 MWh for the first three months of 2001, respectively,[22] and the Commission's then chairman reportedly advised Californians at the

---

21 *See American Electric Power Service Companies, et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,345 (2003), *Enron Power Marketing, Inc. et al* (2003) and *Investigation of Anomalous Bidding Behavior and Practices in the Western Markets*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,347 (2003) where the Commission establishes proceedings to investigate manipulative and questionable bidding behavior.

22 *See respectively*, 94 FERC ¶ 61,245 (2001), 94 FERC ¶ 62,245 (2001), and an unpublished *Notice of Proxy Price for April Wholesale Transactions in the California Wholesale Electric Market* issued by the Director, Office of Markets, Tariffs and Rates, April 16, 2001.

time that the only way out of the crisis was to "start putting shovels in the ground."[23]

This is the unprecedented environment in which these contracts were negotiated. The economic signals that formed the basis of the negotiations, and consequently the contract terms, were severely tainted. Buyers had their backs to the wall under these circumstances and essentially negotiated out of fears of yet higher prices or blackouts for their customers. Such conditions, spread over an area as large as the western United States, are truly extraordinary. And those conditions had extraordinary effects. For example:

- This Commission found it necessary in June 2001 to cap prices across this entire thirteen state region, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.[24] Such broad market intervention by this agency was unprecedented.
- A major California utility, Pacific Gas and Electric, declared bankruptcy as a direct result of the crisis and a second utility, Southern California Edison, teetered on the edge of bankruptcy.
- Local economies suffered devastating effects as a result of these market conditions. In the Pacific Northwest, factories closed and jobs were lost. The aluminum industry has exited the region for all intents and purposes.
- The movement toward competitive electricity markets at the national and state levels was almost brought to a halt. Consumers and policymakers were shocked and outraged that an out of control electricity market could wreak such havoc.

---

[23] Statement attributed to Chairman Hebert, San Francisco Chronicle, April 12, 2001 (as reported on the San Francisco Chronicle's web site—<www.sfgate.com>.)

[24] *San Diego Gas & Electric Company*, 95 FERC ¶ 61,418 (2001).

The tainted atmosphere in which these contracts were negotiated was unprecedented and extraordinary. The most influential benchmark used in negotiating forward contracts—the spot market and expectations of future spot prices—was wildly dysfunctional. When these contracts were negotiated, the Commission had already declared that conditions in the California markets allowed the exercise of market power and rates were unjust and unreasonable. And we now know that there was unprecedented manipulation of both the natural gas and electricity markets and epidemic false reporting of natural gas trading data.

There is simply no persuasive public interest rationale for protecting and sanctifying contracts negotiated in this unprecedented and extraordinary environment. Those market conditions certainly tainted any contracts negotiated during this time frame. It would simply defy logic to conclude that the high prices in these contracts were not adversely influenced by market conditions that included the exercise of market power and widespread market manipulation. Upholding such contracts violates the public interest. These contracts must be reformed.

Remedy

I would remand this case to an Administrative Law Judge to determine specifically how each contract should be reformed. I would also recommend that the judge use the method set out in staff's Western Markets Report for determining the mitigated price in each contract. I suggest this method because staff's analysis has great credibility—it had access to the most comprehensive data base of forward price contracts for the period and locations in question.

Staff's econometric analysis estimates the statistical relationship between spot power prices and forward contract prices (the "spot power elasticity"). This relationship shows how much forward prices rise for each percentage increase in spot prices. Staff also developed a formula representing the relationship between the degree to which spot power prices were excessive and the appropriate level for mitigated forward prices. This formula can be used

to set mitigated forward contract prices. The excessiveness of spot prices (or the "spot power distortion" in staff's formulation) can be estimated by using the mitigated market clearing prices (MMCPs) being developed in the California refund proceeding. The MMCPs will represent the just and reasonable prices in the California spot markets. The spot power distortion can then be plugged into staff's formula to develop the mitigated forward prices.[25]

For these reasons, I dissent from today's order.

Nora Mead BROWNELL, Commissioner, *concurring*

1. I have been very clear in my prior statements about my belief in the sanctity of contracts. However, the issue of how to weigh contract sanctity in the context of the Western power crisis is, to say the least, a very difficult one, and I have struggled with it. The parties in this case were afforded the opportunity of a trial-type hearing and I have reviewed the evidence developed during that hearing. I have read the ALJ's Initial Decision and considered the parties' briefs on that Decision. I have also reviewed Staff's Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets and the evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding in the context of this case. Finally, the Commission took the unusual step of providing the parties an additional opportunity to address the issues in an oral argument before the Commission itself, and I have carefully considered all points raised during that oral argument. After reviewing all of this information, I agree with the order's conclusion that these were contracts voluntarily entered into and the Complainants have not met their burden of proving that the contracts are contrary to the public interest.

---

25 *See* pages V-16 to V-18 of the Western Markets Report.

2. I am writing separately to express my concern about one aspect of the order: the rationale for concluding that modification of the contracts is subject to the public interest standard of review. When these cases were set for hearing, I noted that existing judicial case law seemed to indicate that the public interest standard applied to all of these contracts based solely on the contracts' silence as to the buyer's right to seek unilateral changes under Section 206.[1] Nevertheless, I was willing to set the issue for hearing so that the parties and the ALJ could have an opportunity to further explore whether my understanding of the case law was accurate. Three ALJs have now independently come to the same conclusion: judicial case law establishes that in the absence of clear contractual language allowing unilateral contract modification, the party seeking the change must meet the public interest standard.[2]

3. This order could have simply affirmed the ALJ's conclusion on this point and ended there the analysis of which standard to apply. That is what I am voting to do. Unfortunately, today's order fails to do so and instead bases the finding of the applicable standard on an analysis of the extrinsic evidence that parties did or did not present at hearing. By doing so, the order ignores the law. The *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine is not an invention of the FERC that we are free to mold as we wish; it is a directive from the Supreme Court. Moreover, the order misses an opportunity to provide clarity and certainty to all market participants

---

[1] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long-Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources, et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087 (2002) (*citing Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1096 (D.C. Cir. 1998) and *Boston Edison Co. v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60, 67 (1st Cir. 2000)).

[2] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long-Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources, et al.*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 28 (2003); *Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company v. Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C.*, et al., 101 FERC ¶ 63,031 at P 27 (2002); and *PacifiCorp v. Reliant Energy Services, Inc.*, et al., 102 FERC ¶ 63,030 at P 18 (2003).

and leaves open the possibility that the Commission may order unnecessary fact-finding on the parties' intent in future contract abrogation cases.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California
v.
Sellers of Long Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources

Docket Nos. EL02-60-000, EL02-60-003 and EL02-60-004

California Electricity Oversight Board
v.
Sellers of Energy and Capacity Under Long-Term Contracts with the California Department of Water Resources

Docket Nos. EL02-62-000, EL02-62-003 and EL02-62-004
(Consolidated)

ORDER ON REHEARING AND CLARIFICATION

(Issued November 10, 2003)

105 FERC ¶ 61,182

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, and Nora Mead Brownell.

1. On February 25, 2002, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) and the California Electricity Oversight Board (CEOB) (collectively, "Complainants") filed complaints seeking to modify certain long-term contracts entered into between the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) and more than

twenty-four (24) sellers.[1] As a result of withdrawals and dismissals, only four sellers remain in this proceeding.[2] They are Mirant America Energy Marketing, LP (Mirant); Coral Power, L.L.C. (Coral); Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc. (Dynegy); and Sempra Energy Resources (Sempra). The complaints allege that the prices, terms and conditions of the contracts are unjust and unreasonable and, to the extent applicable, not in the public interest, and that the respondents obtained the prices, terms and conditions in the contracts through the exercise of market power in violation of the Federal Power Act (FPA).

---

[1] *See Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,354 n.21 (June 26 Order).

[2] *Id.* We also granted withdrawal of the complaints as to *Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC (Allegheny)* on July 11, 2003. *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 104 FERC ¶ 61,074 (2003).

On August 6, 2003, Complainants moved to dismiss with prejudice their complaints against El Paso Merchant Energy, L.P. (El Paso) as Complainants and El Paso have reached a comprehensive settlement (Master Settlement Agreement) resolving Complainants' claims against El Paso in this proceeding. Complainants further request that the dismissal be void *ab initio* if the Effective Date under the Master Settlement Agreement never occurs. We grant Complainants' motion and dismiss their complaints as to El Paso with prejudice. *See also* Rule 216 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.216 (2003). This dismissal will be void *ab initio* if the Effective Date under the Master Settlement Agreement never occurs.

On September 25, 2003, Complainants moved to withdraw with prejudice their complaints as to Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc. Consistent with Rule 216 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.216 (2003), the withdrawal has become effective by operation of law.

On April 25, 2002, we dismissed the complaints as to contracts entered into after June 20, 2001. *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087 at pp. 61,383-84 (April 25 Order), *order on reh'g*, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 (2002) (July 23 Order).

2. On June 26, 2003, we denied the complaints.[3] In this Order, we deny the requests for rehearing, reaffirm our conclusion that the record in this proceeding does not support modification of the contracts at issue for the reasons stated below, and address the request for clarification. This Order is in the public interest because it balances effective rate regulation with respect for the sanctity of contracts, as dictated by the U.S. Supreme Court under the *Mobile-Sierra*[4] doctrine.

I. Background

3. In the April 25 Order, we found that the Mirant and Coral contracts contained explicit provisions limiting the contracting parties' rights to make unilateral FPA Section 205 or Section 206 filings, as well as the FPA Section 206 rights of third parties, to amend the contract, and, therefore, Complainants would have to satisfy the public interest standard of review set out in *Mobile-Sierra* to justify the requested contract modification.[5]

4. As for the contracts that did not contain explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions (the Dynegy and Sempra contracts), we found the record was insufficient to determine whether Complainants would face a Mobile-Sierra burden of proof or the FPA Section 206 just and reasonable burden of proof to justify modification.[6] Thus, we "set for hearing the issue of whether the complainants must bear the burden of showing that [the Dynegy or Sempra] contract[s] [are] contrary to the public interest, or whether they will bear the burden of showing that the contract[s] [are] not just and reasonable."[7]

---

[3] June 26 Order, 103 FERC ¶ 61,354.

[4] *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) (*Mobile*); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956) (*Sierra*).

[5] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383.

[6] *Id.*

[7] *Id.*

5. We also set for hearing, as to the Mirant, Coral, Dynegy, and Sempra contracts, the limited issue of "whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted."[8] If the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) were to conclude that modification of one or more of the contracts was warranted, she was not to determine how those contracts should be modified.[9] "The evidentiary hearing was established to, among other things, interpret the terms of [the contracts at issue] and to ascertain the intent of the parties at the time these contracts were signed."[10]

6. On December 17, 2002, we directed the ALJ to omit the initial decision as to contracts containing explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions and to certify the record as to those contracts directly to the Commission.[11] Then, on January 10, 2003, we again instructed the ALJ to "determin[e] which standard of review applies to the contracts not containing explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language" and clarified that:

> [a]s to the contracts for which the Presiding ALJ finds the applicable standard of review to be the 'just and reasonable' standard, the ALJ should then address the question of whether the 'just and reasonable' standard has been met. As to the contracts for which the Presiding ALJ determines that the applicable standard of review is the 'public interest' standard, the ALJ should certify the record directly to the Commission.

---

[8] *Id.* at p. 61,384 (footnote omitted).

[9] *Id.*

[10] July 23 Order at p. 61,393.

[11] *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,293 (2002).

The Commission will then determine whether the 'public interest' standard has been met.[12]

7. On January 16, 2003, after holding an evidentiary hearing held on December 2-12, 2002, the ALJ issued an initial decision on the limited burden of proof/standard of review issue we directed and certified the record to us for determination of all remaining issues.[13] The ALJ found that each contract's language and the evidence presented at the hearing persuasively demonstrated that the contracting parties did not, nor did they intend to, preserve their rights to make unilateral application to the Commission for modification of the contracts.[14]

Dynegy Contract

8. The ALJ explained that, while the Dynegy contract did not contain a provision specifically addressing the parties' FPA Section 205 or Section 206 rights, a provision in a subpart of the contract (Section 8, Paragraph F of the System Contingent Capacity Purchase and Sales Agreement) "appears to limit CDWR's right to take any action which is inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of the rates..."[15] That section provides that:

---

12 *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,025 at P 13 (2003).

13 *Public Utilities Commission of California v. Sellers of Long Term Contracts*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 (2003) (*Partial Initial Decision*).

14 *Id.* at P 43 (*citing, e.g.*, Exh. SER-1 at 34:6-26, 34:10-26 (Niggli); Exh. SER-32 at 6:17-28 (Niggli); Exh. DYN-1 at 33:10-34:5 (Lednicky)); *id.* at P 45. The ALJ noted that "the extrinsic evidence of record indicate[d] that the State had very little confidence in the Commission as an avenue for relief at the time these contracts were negotiated, that CDWR negotiated the subject contracts in a 'crisis' environment, and that for various reasons CDWR's negotiating team focused almost exclusively on the pricing terms of the subject contracts. In fact, at least one witness testified that precluding unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, terms and conditions was an issue of importance to CDWR and that the parties agreed to language to this effect in their executed contract." *Id.* at P 43.

15 *Id.* at P 37.

> CDWR acknowledges and agrees that all payments to [Dynegy] hereunder,... are 'just and reasonable' within the meaning of Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code and that CDWR shall not take any action or fail to take any action which is inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of such payments.[16]

9. The ALJ also noted witness testimony that "Dynegy insisted on this provision, otherwise Dynegy would not have had any assurance of payment and no assurance that CDWR would not later seek to devise a way to abrogate the contract."[17] That same witness asserted that "any argument advanced by, or on behalf of CDWR, that the FERC can or should review and determine whether the Agreement, or payments under the Agreement are 'just and reasonable' is the taking of an action 'inconsistent with the just and reasonable nature of the payments' and is expressly prohibited by the Agreement."[18]

10. Although acknowledging that "this Commission's determination regarding whether a rate is just and reasonable is not governed by Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code," the ALJ found that Section 8, paragraph F of the System Contingent Capacity Purchase and Sales Agreement:

> suggest[s] that the parties agreed that they would not take any action which is inconsistent with the presumed just and reasonable nature of the rates in this contract. Accordingly, and because the contract is otherwise silent with respect to the parties' Sections 205 and 206 rights,... the *Mobile-Sierra* 'public interest' standard should be applied in this instance.[19]

---

16 *Id.* (*quoting* Exh. DYN-2 at EOB-DYN-1-0005286).

17 *Id.* (*citing* Exh. DYN-1 at 33:6-9).

18 *Id.* (*quoting* Exh. DYN-1 at 33:15-34:5).

19 *Id.* at P 38 (*citing* Exh. S-4 at 10:15-12:10); *see id.* at P 43.

Sempra Contract

11. The ALJ found that one provision in the Sempra contract addresses the parties' rights under FPA Sections 205 and 206:[20]

> FERC. The Parties acknowledge that (i) this agreement provides for wholesale power sales subject to the jurisdiction of the FERC under the FPA; and (ii) the rates, terms and conditions of this Agreement are 'just' and 'reasonable' within the meaning of the FPA and that changes in market conditions will not render such rates, terms and conditions 'unjust' or 'unreasonable' for purposes of Section 206 of the FPA.[21]

12. The ALJ further noted the explanation of Sempra's witness that, initially, Sempra proposed contract language that would give both CDWR and Sempra the unilateral right to seek contract modification, but, because CDWR did not want FERC to have the ability to review the rates, terms and conditions of the contract, they agreed to alter the contract to limit the unilateral right of either Sempra or CDWR to modify the contract's rates, terms or conditions of service.[22] Based on the contract language quoted above and the cited witness testimony, the ALJ concluded that the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard applies to the Sempra contract.[23]

13. In addition, the ALJ noted Complainants' concession that they:

> have not argued, or submitted evidence, to the effect that the absence of an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision in the [Dynegy and Sempra] contracts is itself a basis for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to those

---

20 *Id.* at P 41 (*citing* Section 10.03 of the Energy Purchase Agreement).

21 *Id.*

22 *Id.* at P 42 (*citing* Exh. SER-1 at 34:10-26).

23 *Id.* at P 42 (*citing* Exh. S-4 at 15:14), P 43, P 45.

contracts. Accordingly, to the extent the *Mobile-Sierra* standard applies to the contracts with explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provisions, it applies to the contracts without such provisions.[24]

14. The ALJ further explained the basis of her determination that unilaterally proposed changes to the Dynegy and Sempra contracts are subject to review under the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard.[25]

> As here, where the contract has not preserved the rights of a party to seek unilateral modifications, the finding that the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review applies to a negotiated contract unless the contract expressly states otherwise serves to protect the expectations of contracting parties that their negotiated agreement will be respected, thus promoting stability of contracts, stability of the market as a whole, and protecting ratepayers by encouraging the utilization of contracts to reduce reliance on the more costly and volatile spot market, while still protecting the 'public interest' as required by the remedial protections afforded to consumers under the FPA.[26]

15. The parties submitted initial trial and reply briefs as well as briefs on exceptions to the Initial Decision and oppositions thereto. Also, on May 15, 2003, we held oral argument.

16. On June 26, 2003, we affirmed the ALJ's finding that the public interest standard of review applies to all the contracts at issue without explicit *Mobile-Sierra* language.[27]

---

[24] *Id.* at P 44 (*quoting* Complainants' January 14, 2003 Answer to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance).

[25] *Id.* at P 43.

[26] *Id.* at P 45 (*citing Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1095 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (*Texaco*); *Town of Norwood v. FERC*, 202 F.3d 392, 400 (1st Cir. 2000); *Papago Tribal Util. Auth. v. FERC*, 723 F.2d 950, 953 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (*Papago*)).

[27] June 26 Order, 103 FERC at P 3.

In doing so, we explained the genesis and parameters of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, its public interest standard, and their impact on our review of requests for contract modification.[28] As we explained, the *Mobile-Sierra* cases and their progeny hold that, where parties contract for a particular rate and do not reserve their rights to unilaterally propose a rate change, a party cannot unilaterally file for a new rate and the Commission cannot act under the FPA just and reasonable standard to supersede the contractually agreed-upon rate.[29] Rather, we can grant a unilateral request to alter a contract under which the requesting party did not reserve its rights to unilaterally propose a rate change only if the proposed change is required by the "public interest."

17. We also denied the complaints, finding that Complainants did not meet their burden of proof under the public interest standard to justify modifying any of the contracts still at issue in this proceeding.[30] Based upon our review of the evidentiary record developed in this proceeding, the findings of the Commission staff's Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets in Docket No. PA02-2-000 (Staff Report), evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding in Docket No. EL00-95, *et al.*, and the totality of the circumstances, we concluded that the Complainants failed to meet their burden of proof under the public interest standard of review.[31] As Complainants devoted most of the evidentiary hearing and briefing to attempting to demonstrate that the contracts were unjust and unreasonable, we found that they presented very little evidence relevant to the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest

---

28 *Id.* at P 4-7.

29 *Id.* at P 4 (*citing Boston Edison Co. v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60, 64-65 (1st. Cir. 2000)).

30 *Id.* at P 3.

31 *Id.* at P 3, 8.

standard that applies here.[32] We also found that the Complainants failed to demonstrate that the contracts in question caused financial distress for the Complainants (or others they represent), threatening their ability to continue service; that the contracts cast an excessive burden on customers; that the contracts were unduly discriminatory; or any other factors showing that modifying the contracts is required by the public interest.[33]

18. For example, we found that, through these contracts, CDWR achieved one of its central objectives of having a portfolio that yields a weighted average price no higher than $70/MWh, the average cost of energy supply reflected in IOUs' retail rates, as of January 2001.[34] In securing its contracts, CDWR also achieved an overall portfolio that is diversified both in terms of energy products and durations.[35] Furthermore, the evidence did not show that the contracts were priced above long-run competitive prices.[36] Nor did Complainants present evidence to support a finding that the contracts are unduly discriminatory or preferential to the detriment of other purchasers who are not parties to the contract.[37]

19. We further found that the extensive evidentiary record regarding the totality of circumstances preceding and following the execution of the contracts at issue shows

---

32 *Id.* at P 39.

33 *Id.* at P 8, 39.

34 *Id.* at P 40 (*citing* Exh. CAL-51 at 10:24-11:3; Exh. AYE/SER-7 at 70:22-71:4 (Hart deposition); Exh. AYE/SER-11 at 64:11-66:2 (Nichols deposition); Tr. at 1258:14-1260:9; Exh. S-8 at 16:2-23; Exh. CAL-70 at 13 of Update of California Department of Water Resources Power Purchase Contract Efforts dated May 31, 2001 (May 31, 2001 CDWR Update); Exh. CAL-51 at 31:16-19; Exh. DYN-1 at 16:25-27).

35 *Id.* (*citing* Exh. DYN-38 at 1).

36 *Id.* (*citing* Exh. MAEM-25 at 6:20-9:22; Exh. COR-48; Exh. COR-50; Exh. CAL-163 at 1:22-2:7).

37 *Id.* at P 41 (*citing Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953 n.4).

that CDWR had options and at least some bargaining power when it entered into this portfolio of contracts after often protracted negotiations.[38] When the contracts were executed, alternatives were available; the parties voluntarily chose to enter into the contracts, accepting market risks.[39]

20. Additionally, we found nothing in the record, in the Staff Report, or in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding evidence to support a finding that there was market manipulation *specific* to the long-term contract negotiations resulting in the prices and terms challenged here.[40] There was no evidence to support a finding of unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations.[41] That left dissatisfaction with the bargain as the only basis for contract modification, an insufficient basis under the public interest standard.[42]

21. Requests for rehearing were filed by Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington (Snohomish), Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE), jointly by Complainants, and jointly by Coral, Dynegy, Mirant and Sempra (Indicated Sellers). Sempra filed an answer to Complainants' reque[illegible] for rehearing, and Complainants filed an answer in response.

---

38 *Id.* at P 42-60 (*citing* numerous record exhibits).

39 *Id.* at P 8.

40 *Id.* at P 61.

41 *Id.* at P 62.

42 *Id.* at P 8, 62 (*citing Potomac Electric Power Company v. FERC*, 210 F.3d 403, 409 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (*PEPCO*); *Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc. v. Central Illinois Public Service Company*, 51 FERC ¶ 61,004 at p. 61,013, *reh'g dismissed as moot*, 52 FERC ¶ 61,149 (1990); *Papago*, 723 F.2d at 953; *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 354-355).

II. Discussion

A. *Procedural Matters*

1. *Ex Parte Allegations*

22. Complainants request that we vacate the June 26 Order and that Chairman Wood and Commissioner Brownell recuse themselves from further proceedings in this matter because, after a Commission open meeting and press conference, Chairman Wood and Commissioner Brownell briefed a group of Wall Street analysts, via a telephone conference, about the open meeting.[43] We deny Complainants' requests.

23. We incorporate and reiterate our finding in an order issued in Docket No. EL02-28 on April 23, 2003,[44] and in an order denying rehearing in that same docket issued contemporaneously with this Order,[45] that the telephone conference briefing, in which the Chairman and Commissioner Brownell simply repeated what they already had discussed at the open meeting and provided general background information, was not an inappropriate *ex parte* communication and did not taint this proceeding.[46] Complainants' proffered statements from the Special Inquiry findings do not change this conclusion. In fact, those findings "did not identify evidence, based on that available record, substantiating the allegation that the conduct of the call violated any Commission procedural rule" and explained that "[n]one of [the 17 Wall Street representatives from 12 companies interviewed, nine of

---

43 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 2, 73-75 (*citing* Special Inquiry findings issued by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of the Inspector General on June 27, 2003 (Special Inquiry findings)).

44 *Nevada Power Co. and Sierra Pacific Power Co. v. Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,080 (2003).

45 *Nevada Power Co. and Sierra Pacific Power Co. v. Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, Docket No. EL02-28-004, *et al.*

46 *Nevada Power Company, et al., v. Enron Power Marketing, Inc., et al.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,080 (2003).

whom acknowledged participating in some or all of the conference call] stated that Chairman Wood or Commissioner Brownell explicitly indicated, during the conference call, how they would vote on the contract cases."[47]

24. Neither the Chairman nor Commissioner Brownell has prejudged the issues here, and, contrary to Complainants' assertion,[48] neither has had any "*ex parte* commitments." Vacation of the June 26 Order and recusal of the Chairman and Commissioner Brownell are therefore neither necessary nor appropriate in this case. We also reiterate our finding in the June 26 Order, at Appendix B, that Complainants' motion for disclosure of the telephone conference briefing is moot, as a summary of events relating to that briefing was filed in the record on April 22, 2003.

25. Even assuming the conference call was a prohibited off-the-record communication, the violation has already been remedied, as disclosure, not recusal, is the appropriate remedy. Administrative proceedings blemished by *ex parte* communications may be remedied administratively by disclosing the communication and its contents.[49] In this regard, in the context of a Commission case, the court found that, by placing summaries of meetings Commission officials held with industry officials, other parties were apprised "of any argument that may have been presented privately, thereby maintaining the integrity of the process and curing any possible prejudice that the contacts may have caused."[50]

---

47 Special Inquiry findings, DOE/IG-0610 June 2003, Results of the Inquiry p. 3.

48 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 2.

49 *See* 5 U.S.C. § 557(d)(1)(C)&(D); Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization v. Federal Labor Relations Authority, 685 F.2d 547, 565 n.36 (1982).

50 *Louisiana Ass'n of Indep. Producers v. FERC*, 958 F.2d 1101, 1112 (D.C. Cir. 1992).

26. In addition, in Louisiana, the court made clear that recusal was not necessary or desirable even though there may have been *ex parte* communications.[51] Recusal here, therefore, would be an extraordinary and unwarranted remedy.[52] In *Power Authority of the State of New York*, the court explained that:

> recusal would be required only if the communications posed a serious likelihood of affecting the agency's ability to act fairly and impartially in the matter before it. In resolving that issue, one must look to the nature of the communications and particularly to whether they contain factual matter or other information outside of the record, which the parties did not have an opportunity to rebut.[53]

27. As described above, the conference call contained no factual matter or other information outside the record, and, even assuming it did, Complainants had ample chance to rebut it at the oral argument or by filing a response.

2. Mirant Bankruptcy

28. On September 12, 2003, the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas issued a "Temporary Restraining Order Against the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission" (TRO) in *In re Mirant Corp. (Mirant Corp. v. FERC)*, Adversary Proceeding No. 03-4355, which enjoins the Commission "from taking any action, directly or indirectly, to require or coerce the [Mirant] Debtors to abide by the terms of any Wholesale Contract [to which a Mirant Debtor is a party] which Debtors are substantially

---

51 *Id.* (*citing FTC v. Cement Inst.*, 333 U.S. 683, 702 (1948) ("It is expected that administrative official will build up expertise through experience with recurring issues.") and *Laird v. Tatum*, 409 U.S. 824, 837 (1972) ("Such expertise should not lightly be tossed aside")).

52 *See Power Authority of the State of New York v. FERC*, 743 F.2d 93, 110 (2d Cir. 1984) ("The mere existence of such communications hardly requires a court or administrative body to disqualify itself.").

53 *Id.*

performing or which Debtors are not performing pursuant to an order of the court unless FERC shall have provided the Debtors with ten (10) days' written notice setting forth in detail the action which FERC seeks to take with respect to any Wholesale Contract which is the subject of this paragraph."

29. Should the TRO be converted into a preliminary injunction, an action that the Commission opposes, the Commission will appeal that order. Despite the Commission's disagreement with the validity of the TRO and its expectation that the TRO (or a preliminary injunction) will be vacated on appeal, the Commission must comply with it until vacated. The TRO requires ten days' written notice before the Commission takes a proscribed action with respect to a covered Mirant Wholesale Contract. Accordingly, to the extent that this Order requires Mirant to act in a manner proscribed by the TRO, the Order will provide written notice to Mirant of the action that FERC will take with respect to a covered Mirant Wholesale Contract, which action will not become effective until ten (10) days after issuance of this Order. In all other respects, this Order is effective immediately.

3. *Other Procedural Matters*

30. On July 26, 2003, as amended on September 2, 2003 and September 5, 2003, CARE filed a request for rehearing in this proceeding. As CARE acknowledged, it is not a party in this proceeding,[54] and it has not sought to intervene. As requests for rehearing can only be filed by parties,[55] we will dismiss CARE's request for rehearing.

31. Rule 713(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures, 18 C.F.R § 385.713(d) (2003), prohibits answers to requests for rehearing. Accordingly, we will reject Sempra's motion for leave to file a limited answer to Complainants' request for rehearing. Under Rule 213(a) of

---

54 CARE Reh'g Request at n.6.

55 *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.713(b) (2003).

the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213 (2003), no answer may be made to a protest or answer unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. Good cause does not exist to justify accepting Complainants' answer to Sempra's motion to file a limited answer; therefore, we will reject this answer.

B. *Substantive Issues*

1. *Whether The Public Interest Standard Applies.*

32. Complainants and Snohomish argue that, in the June 26 Order, the Commission violated its statutory obligation to ensure just and reasonable rates when it determined that it could impose a higher burden of proof before mitigating unjust and unreasonable prices in the contracts at issue. They state that the Commission can apply the public interest standard to determine whether prices should be mitigated only after its finds that the contract prices at issue here are just and reasonable.

33. As discussed below, the Commission has not violated its statutory obligation with respect to modification of contracts, as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court. The *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine holds that in cases "where parties have negotiated a ... contract that sets firm prices ... and that denies either party the right to change such prices [] unilaterally, [the Commission] may abrogate or modify the contract only if the public interest so requires."[56] Under the public interest standard, the sole concern of the Commission is whether the challenged rate adversely affects the public interest,[57] and the Commission can exercise its authority to modify contracts only where the public interest demands such action.[58] The burden to demonstrate that the contract rates in question in this proceeding are contrary to the

---

56 *Texaco*, 148 F.3d at 1095.

57 *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 354-5.

58 *Union Pacific Fuels, Inc.*, 129 F.3d 157, 161 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (*quoting Metropolitan Edison Co. v. FERC*, 595 F.2d 851, 856 n.29 (D.C. Cir. 1979)).

public interest is on the Complainants. The Complainants in this proceeding, however, have failed to make such a showing. As established in the June 26 Order and affirmed in this order on rehearing, the contracts at issue are subject to the public interest standard of review. Once a party signs a *Mobile-Sierra* contract, it cannot escape by later claiming that the rates were not just and reasonable when it signed the contract, unless there is evidence such as the seller fraudulently inducing the buyer to execute the contract. However, no such evidence was found in the evidentiary record, including the Staff Report and the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding submittals.

34. In response to the Complainants' arguments that the Commission can apply the public interest standard of review only after it finds that the contract rates were just and reasonable,[59] Complainants fail to acknowledge that the contracts were lawfully entered into pursuant to prior findings and authorization by the Commission under Section 205 of the FPA.[60] Upon a showing that the seller lacks or has mitigated market power in the relevant market, the Commission pre-determines under Section 205 of the FPA that sales at market-based rates will be just and reasonable.[61] In effect, the Commission makes a "blanket" just and reasonable determination which applies to subsequent market-based sales made by the seller. As we explained in our June 26 Order, if we were required to examine every long-term service agreement as if the seller was seeking new market-based rate authority, it would make the original grant of authority a pointless exercise of no value to anyone.

35. The Commission has held that this grant of market-based rate authority constitutes what is known as the

---

59 *See also* Snohomish Reh'g Request at 11, 12, 14-15, 18-22, 35.

60 *16 U.S.C. § 824d (2000).*

61 *Louisiana Power Authority v. FERC*, 141 F.3d 364, 365 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *Elizabethtown Gas Co. v. FERC*, 10 F.3d 866, 870 (D.C. Cir. 1993).

"initial review" of rates in the cost-based rate context. Then, if the parties have not agreed to apply the public interest standard to future challenges, a party may come to the Commission pursuant to Section 206 of the FPA[62] and demonstrate that the rate is no longer just and reasonable. Alternatively, a party who does not have such a right may seek changes by demonstrating that the contract rate is contrary to the public interest. In essence, the Complainants and Snohomish attempt to add another layer to this two-step process, claiming that parties to contracts that are subject to the public interest standard of review should have another opportunity to argue that the rate was not just and reasonable at the outset. This argument, however, has no support in either the statute or the relevant Commission or court precedent. Indeed, the Complainants' suggested approach would create uncertainty in the market, as a party who suddenly finds that its deal has become uneconomical, can undo the terms to which it was contractually bound. This is precisely what the Mobile-Sierra doctrine was designed to avoid, and we see no support for an exception to this established doctrine simply because a party has contracted in a market-based rate regime.

36. Our decision in Lockyer[63] supports this result. The "view that only cost-based or formula rate models satisfy the statutory framework fundamentally misapprehends the Commission's ratemaking authority."[64] Lockyer held that market-based rate certificates satisfy the FPA Section 205(c)[65] requirement that rates be on file with the Commission and recognized that the Commission reviews the reasonableness of the use of market-based rates prior to

---

62 16 U.S.C. § 824e (2000).

63 *State of California ex re Lockyer v. British Columbia Power Exchange Corp., et al..*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,247 (2002) (Lockyer).

64 *Id.* at 62,062.

65 16 U.S.C. § 824d(c) (2000).

their effectiveness. "Prior review consists, however, not of the particular prices agreed to by willing buyers and sellers. Rather, it consists of analysis to assure that the seller lacks or has mitigated market power so that its prices will fall within a zone of reasonableness."[66]

37. Thus, at the time sellers are granted market-based rate certificates, their rates are subject to the initial review required by the FPA. This review is different than that conducted for cost-based rates because "[t]he availability of genuine alternatives provides a sufficient basis ... to conclude that 'market discipline' will be sufficient to keep the prices that sellers charge within the statutorily-prescribed just and reasonable zone."[67] We reject the parties' argument that this approach is insufficient to satisfy the statute. Our decision in *Lockyer* is on all fours with our finding here.

38. Indicated Sellers seek clarification that the public interest standard of review does not authorize unjust and unreasonable rates. We clarify as follows. Indicated Sellers are correct that rates initially must be just and reasonable. For market-based rates, this determination is made when the authorization for market-based rates is granted. However, if rates subsequently become unjust and unreasonable and the contract at issue is subject to the *Mobile-Sierra* standard of review, the Commission under court precedent may not change the contract simply because it is no longer just and reasonable. If parties' market-based rate contracts provide for the public interest standard of review, the Commission is bound to a higher burden to support modification of such contracts. The public interest standard applies to changes to contract rates and "represents the Supreme Court's attempt to strike a balance between private contractual rights and the regulatory power to modify contracts when necessary to

---

66 *Lockyer*, 99 FERC at 62,063.

67 *Id.*

protect the public interest."[68] Our finding that changes to the challenged contracts should be evaluated under the public interest standard does not equate to a finding that the underlying rates are not just and reasonable. To the extent Indicated Sellers' request for clarification asks the Commission to opine on matters not before us in this case, we decline to do so.

39. Complainants assert that the dysfunction in the spot market caused the rates in the specific long-term market-based rate contracts at issue here to be unjust and unreasonable from the outset and, therefore, that the just and reasonable standard of review, rather than the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard of review, should apply. "Under these extraordinary circumstances," Complainants argue, "it is error for the Commission to uphold the presumption that the prices in any contract entered during the California energy crisis for delivery in the Western markets by a seller with market-based rate authority are just and reasonable."[69]

40. Because a party who has executed a *Mobile-Sierra* contract cannot avoid its burden to show that a unilaterally proposed change is required by the public interest by claiming that the rates were not just and reasonable when that party executed the contract (unless, *e.g.*, the contract was induced by fraud committed by the seller on the buyer), we reject Complainants' arguments.

41. We also find no merit to Complainants' claims regarding the testimony of Drs. Tabors and Stoft, which, as is clear from the testimony itself as well as from Complainants' January 10, 2003 Post-Hearing Initial Brief, their rehearing request, and other pleadings, were based on forward price curves (forward price curves internally generated by each seller, and the one produced by Navigant Consulting for the buyer). All of these forward price curve

---

68 *Northeast Util. Serv. Co., v FERC*, 55 F.3d 686, 689 (1st Cir. 1995).

69 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 68.

models project the various input costs (*e.g.*, the cost of gas, NOx emission allowances) under expected future supply and demand conditions. The resulting forward price curves project the forward spot market prices for delivery of electricity over a period in the future. The sellers argue that they used their forward price curves as a floor and negotiated for higher prices. Meanwhile, Complainants argue that CDWR's own forward curve (and the sellers' internally generated price curves) stood as a ceiling and CDWR negotiated for a lower price.

42. Complainants use the expert testimony to argue that: the forward price curves can appropriately be used to test the justness and reasonableness of the rates under the long term contracts; because the forward curve model used by CDWR incorporated inputs that were not cleansed of market dysfunction, the rates CDWR negotiated were excessive; in late May 2001, the forward and spot prices declined synchronously purportedly proving that high spot prices caused forward prices to be excessive. The sellers disputed all these arguments.

43. Forward price curves are internally generated, proprietary information used by a party for its own purposes. Each seller and buyer uses its own projections and updates these daily or more often if circumstances change rapidly. Each model is slightly different in its assumptions and therefore will produce different price estimates. While this data is useful for resource planning and contract negotiation purposes, we cannot use that data to judge contract rates. Not only were these forward curve models not designed for that purpose, but the requisite transparency that Commission rate review must have is absent. Moreover, the Commission has never addressed or approved any one particular forward curve model for this purpose, and we find that, even if we could do so, we cannot do so on the record here. Accordingly, we find that it would be inappropriate to rely on the forward price curves and the testimony regarding those curves.

44. Complainants' attempt to use Drs. Pechman's and Ringo's expert testimony to argue that the contracts at issue should be modified because they differ from the advisory benchmark we provided in the December 15, 2000 Order fails as well. Additionally, Snohomish asserts that the Commission arbitrarily and capriciously found that CDWR achieved its central objective in establishing its energy portfolio despite the fact that the average price for the first five years of the terms of the contracts exceeded the advisory benchmark.[70]

45. Complainants refer to our December 15, 2000 Order[71] in which we declined to extend the California spot market mitigation measures to forward markets.[72] In that order, we also adopted an advisory benchmark of $74/MWh for five-year contracts for supply around-the-clock to be used as a reference point in addressing any complaints regarding the pricing of contracts negotiated in forward markets. While we expected that the benchmark would be helpful in assessing possible complaints challenging forward prices, we never suggested that a contractual price exceeding the benchmark would be all by itself a sufficient ground for abrogating a contract. Quite to the contrary, we expected that "buyers may elect to negotiate above [the benchmark] to the extent they believe the particular contract or supplier brings value which suits their needs (e.g., shorter term contracts, favorable terms and conditions, assignment of the risk of variable cost exposure, the particular characteristics of the supplier or its resource portfolio, etc.)."[73]

46. Complainants conceded below that the Dynegy, Mirant and Sempra contracts do not lend themselves to

---

70 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 36.

71 *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,294 (2000) (December 15 Order).

72 *Id.* at p. 61,994.

73 *Id.* at p. 61,995.

comparison with the five-year advisory benchmark.[74] Thus, the benchmark arguments apply only to the Coral contract. To apply the $74/MWh benchmark we set in the December 15 Order for a five-year, supply around-the-clock benchmark to the 11-year Coral contract that does not provide for supply around-the-clock, Complainants' experts used a hybrid analysis.[75] That analysis used the benchmark rate for the first five years of the contract and Coral's segmented forward curve for the remainder of the contract. We never intended such a hybrid approach to be used for benchmark comparisons, and we find that approach unsupported and unacceptable. We already have explained that it would be inappropriate to use a seller's internal forward curve to reach a determination on a contract's rates.

47. Snohomish argues that the Commission's initial review of a seller's market power for purposes of granting market-based rate authority cannot assure that all the rates the seller subsequently charges will be just and reasonable under all circumstances.[76] We agree with Snohomish's position. Indeed, we have recognized that "FPA [Section] 206 complaint procedures apply when it appears that [market-based] rates are no longer just and reasonable."[77] Should a seller acquire market power subsequent to the Commission's acceptance of market-based rates, there is a safeguard that "places sellers on notice that their transactions will be subject to review and to prospective remedial action, including the possible loss of their market-

---

74 Complainants' January 10, 2003 Post-Hearing Brief at 92, 98, App B p. 27.

75 Exh. CAL-112.

76 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 17, 26-29 (*citing AEP Power Marketing, Inc.*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,219 (2001); *Enron Power Marketing, Inc.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,343 (2003); *Enron Power Marketing, Inc.*, 104 FERC ¶ 63,010 at P 128 (2003)).

77 *Lockyer* at p. 62,064.

pricing authorization."[78] Contrary to Snohomish's position, however, this remedial authority does not require contract modification where the contract limits changes to those required by the public interest under Mobile-Sierra. As discussed, there has been no showing to support a finding that respondents exercised market power while selling under their market-based pricing authorization with regard to these specific contracts. Thus, there is no reason to move beyond the self-imposed limits on contract changes set by the parties in the challenged contracts. This result is consistent with both our responsibility to assure that market-based rates are just and reasonable and our long-standing respect for the sanctity of private contracts.

48. Snohomish challenges the Commission's determination, based on *Borough of Lansdale v. FPC*[79] and *Richmond Power & Light v. FPC*,[80] that Mobile-Sierra applies to contracts not on file with the Commission. Contrary to Snohomish's argument, the Commission did not find *Lansdale* and *Richmond* to hold that "entities holding market-based rate certificates [are entitled] to charge unjust and unreasonable rates."[81] Instead, as Snohomish itself concedes, the Commission relied on the *Lansdale* and *Richmond* cases to demonstrate that a party may not circumvent *Mobile-Sierra*'s limitations by failing to file a contract with the Commission.[82] The Commission reasoning here was sound.

49. Snohomish further argues that the Commission should have reviewed the contracts at issue under the just

---

78 *Id.* at p. 62,065.

79 494 F.2d 1004, 1113 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

80 481 F.2d 490, 497 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

81 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 16-17.

82 *Id.* at 16 (claiming that the cases hold that "utilities do not gain the right, denied them by the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, to challenge contract rates as too low simply by failing to comply with the FPA's requirement that all jurisdictional contracts be on file with the Commission.").

and reasonable standard to protect the rights of third parties, especially electric ratepayers.[83] In addition, Snohomish contends that the Commission at the very least should have applied the flexible public interest standard.[84]

50. There is no Commission or court precedent that supports a finding that a non-signatory party may challenge a *Mobile-Sierra* contract under the just and reasonable standard of review, as opposed to the public interest standard of review. The cases cited by Snohomish as dictating application of the just and reasonable standard of review are inapposite. In *PJM Interconnection, LLC*,[85] the Reliability Assurance Agreement explicitly permitted PJM to submit filings under Section 206 of the FPA.[86] In the instant proceeding, the contracts in question do not contain such a provision. Snohomish also cites to *Carolina Power and Light Co.*[87] which involved a Commission directive to revise a settlement agreement that had been submitted for Commission acceptance, and not, as in this case, a complaint challenging an existing market-based rate contract for the sale of power. Finally, Snohomish refers to *Pennsylvania Electric Co.*[88] which speaks in general terms about the Commission's statutory duty to ensure just and reasonable rates. However, the Commission has applied the public interest standard of review to challenges brought by non-contractual parties.[89] In addition, we found no basis for applying a more flexible public interest standard to the contracts at issue. The record shows that the third-party

---

83 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 39-40.

84 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 41 (*citing* Snohomish Brief on Exceptions at 13-15).

85 *PJM Interconnection, LLC*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,206 (2001).

86 *See id.* at p. 61,878 n.12.

87 *Carolina Power and Light Co.*, 69 FERC ¶ 61,078 (1994).

88 *Pennsylvania Electric Co. v. FERC*, 11 F.3d 207 (D.C. Cir. 1993).

89 *See, e.g.*, July 23 Order, 100 FERC at p. 61,396.

intervenors were not adversely affected by the contract at issue. Similarly, Complainants have failed to show that the contracts at issue imposed an excessive burden on California's ratepayers.

51. Complainants and Snohomish nonetheless assert that the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard of review does not apply to the contracts at issue because, purportedly, Complainants are third parties to the contracts as CDWR, rather than the CPUC or CEOB, executed the contracts. As we previously found,[90] however, the State of California, through one of its agents, CDWR, was a party to the contracts. Complainants, like CDWR, are agents of the State of California, and, therefore, in bringing these complaints, Complainants stepped into the shoes of CDWR as a representative of the State of California. Complainants' own rehearing request supports this conclusion. Throughout the rehearing request, Complainants acknowledge that the buyer under these contracts was the State of California.[91]

52. There also is no merit to Complainants' claim that the Commission's statement in the December 15 Order, that "[t]o address concerns about potentially unjust and unreasonable rates in the long-term markets, we will monitor prices in those markets,"[92] "informed buyers and sellers that the Commission would scrutinize long-term contract rates under a just and reasonable standard."[93] The

---

90 June 26 Order at P 76.

91 *See, e.g.*, Complainants' Reh'g Request at 48 ("the State of California was forced to step in as the entity responsible for purchasing California's "net short,"); Complainants' Reh'g Request at 32 ("it was necessary for the State of California to take the unprecedented step of becoming the buyer for most of the load of the entire state. It did so by authorizing CDWR to purchase the State's 'net short ...."); Complainants Reh'g Request at 63 ("the State on the public's behalf ... enter[ed] the long-term contracts).

92 December 15 Order, 93 FERC at p. 61,994.

93 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 9.

referenced statement in the December 15 Order did not, and did not intend to, inform any one that unilaterally proposed rate changes to contracts universally would be reviewed under a just and reasonable standard of review. Under *Mobile-Sierra*, unless the parties to a contract reserve their rights to unilaterally propose a rate change, the Commission can grant a unilateral request for a rate change only if the proposed change is required by the public interest. We cannot, and did not attempt to, trump the mandates of that long-standing case law.

53. There also is no merit to Complainants' contention that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine does not apply to the contracts here because the doctrine is not intended to protect the sanctity of contracts entered into by wrongdoers[94] or the contention that the public interest standard of review is satisfied because "it is against the public interest for sellers to retain the benefits of contracts entered into by virtue of their market-based authority, but which market-based authority they abused."[95] Complainants do not cite to any precedent for these propositions. More importantly, the wrongdoing cited by Complainants involves alleged activities by Mirant and Dynegy in the spot markets, not the forward markets. As mentioned above, we found nothing in the record, in the Staff Report, or in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding evidence to support a finding that there was market manipulation *specific to* the long-term contract negotiations resulting in the prices and terms challenged here.[96]

54. In discussing the ALJ's initial decision in the June 26 Order, we stated that she noted that "while the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine arose in the context of a completely regulated environment, where, as here, the contracts were entered into under the parties' market-based rate authority,

---

94 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 10-12, 22.

95 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 12.

96 June 26 Order at P 61.

the Commission has stated that '[p]reservation of the contracts has, if anything, become even more critical.'"[97] Complainants ask us to explain this statement. As we explained in the April 25 Order:

> The Commission's long-standing policy, consistent with a substantial body of Supreme Court and other judicial precedent, has been to recognize the sanctity of contracts. Rarely has the Commission deviated from that policy, and then only in extreme circumstances, such as the fundamental industry-wide restructuring under Order No. 888 and the reorganization of a bankrupt utility. Preservation of contracts has, if anything, become even more critical since the policy was first adopted. Competitive power markets simply cannot attract the capital needed to build adequate generating infrastructure without regulatory certainty, including certainty that the Commission will not modify market-based contracts unless there are extraordinary circumstances.[98]

55. The critical point is not, however, that sanctity of contracts is even more important in a market-based rate system, but that sanctity of contracts remains vitally important whether the regulatory system is cost-based or market-based.

56. Snohomish argues that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies only in situations where a regulated utility is challenging a contract with a rate it argues is too low.[99] As we stated in the June 26 Order, "[i]n later cases, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine was applied to contracts containing rates that allegedly were too high."[100] Snohomish, however,

---

97 *Id.* at P 64 (*quoting Partial Initial Decision*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 31 (*quoting* April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383)).

98 April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383 (footnote omitted).

99 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 12.

100 June 26 Order at P 6.

believes that the *PSC of New York*[101] case the Commission relied on is inapposite.[102] We disagree. The court in *PSC of New York* held that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine protects contracts, not rates; it obligates both buyers and sellers, and the Commission is no more at liberty to alter a contract "to the prejudice of the producers than to do so in their favor."[103] In addition, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine has been applied in other cases where a complainant sought to reduce the existing rate.[104]

2. *Whether Complainants Met Their Public Interest Burden.*

57. Complainants also argue that they have met their public interest burden regarding the contracts at issue. First, Complainants, and Snohomish, assert that the Commission failed to recognize that the three-part *Sierra* "test" is not the sole measure of the public interest standard.[105] This assertion is incorrect. The June 26 Order explicitly found that the Complainants failed to demonstrate any of the three public interest factors addressed in *Sierra or any other factors* showing that modifying the contracts is required by the public interest.[106] On rehearing, we also have fully considered and addressed all of Complainants' public interest claims. Our discussion of those claims in the June 26 Order and in this Order makes clear that we reject the claims not because we believe we are restricted to considering only the three factors enunciated in *Sierra*, but because we find the claims do not satisfy Complainants'

---

101 *Public Service Commission of the State of New York v. FPC*, 543 F.2d 757 (D.C. Cir. 1974) (*PSC of New York*).

102 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 15-16.

103 *PSC of New York*, 543 F.2d at 798.

104 *PEPCO*, 210 F.3d 403.

105 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 13, 15, 64, 65; Snohomish Reh'g Request at 32.

106 June 26 Order at PP 8, 39.

public interest burden. Thus, we reject this and any other arguments premised on the Commission restricting its consideration of the public interest to the three factors addressed in *Sierra* because they have no basis in fact. For these same reasons, we reject Snohomish's argument that the Commission ignored every aspect of the public interest outside of the contract negotiations despite evidence of fraud, abuse and manipulative practices.[107]

58. Snohomish argues that the June 26 Order is inconsistent with decisions in *French Broad Elec. Membership Corp. v. Carolina Power & Light Co.*[108] *and Texaco v FERC.*[109] In addition, Snohomish claims that the public interest is met because (1) there is evidence that the bargaining process leading to the execution of the contracts was not the product of a functionally competitive market, and (2) after a period of market dysfunction, the contracts were no longer economical.[110]

59. In the June 26 Order, we determined that Complainants failed to demonstrate that contract modification was required by the public interest.[111] We considered whether Complainants had demonstrated that "any of the three prongs announced in the *Sierra* case [was] met or that any other factor introduced into evidence warrant[ed] a finding that any of the contracts is contrary to the public interest and should be modified."[112] We found none of the *Sierra* factors to be present here—whether the rate might impair the ability of the public utility to continue service, cast upon other consumers an excessive burden, or be unduly discriminatory. Moreover, we considered the

---

107 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 34-35.

108 92 FERC ¶ 61,283 (2000).

109 *Texaco*, 148 F.3d at 1097.

110 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 33-34.

111 June 26 Order at PP 3, 8, 39, 60-63.

112 *Id.* at P 39.

totality of the circumstances preceding and following the execution of the contracts and found that none justified contract modification.

60. Further, we find Snohomish's reliance on *Atlantic City Elec. Co. v. FERC*,[113] *Northeast Utils. Service Co. v. FERC*,[114] and *Town of Norwood v. FERC*[115] to be misplaced. Snohomish's claims that all three demonstrate that the public interest standard of review is met when "there is evidence that the bargaining process leading to the execution of the contracts was not the product of a functionally competitive market."[116] However, Snohomish's reading of the cases is not entirely accurate. All three cases recognize that *Mobile-Sierra* preserves the parties' bargain as reflected in the contract, when there is no need to question what transpired at the contract formation stage.[117] Our decision here is consistent with those cases, as there has been no showing to support a finding of fraud, duress, or the exercise of market power at the contract formation stage.[118]

61. In addition, we reject Snohomish's contention that there are broad policy concerns sufficient to satisfy *Mobile-Sierra*'s public interest standard.[119] There is no policy initiative that would be served by modifying the challenged

---

113 295 F.3d 1, 14 (D.C. Cir. 2002), *remanded*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,318 (2002), *vacated in part*, 329 F.3d 856 (2003).

114 993 F.2d 937, 961 (1st Cir. 1993), *remanded*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332, *reh'g denied*, 68 FERC ¶ 61,041, *aff'd*, 55 F.3d 686 (1995).

115 587 F.2d 1306, 1313-14 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

116 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 33.

117 295 F. 3d at 14; 993 F.2d at 961; 587 F.2d at 1313-14.

118 Contrary to Snohomish's argument, we did not, nor did we intend to "require[] a showing of unfairness, bad faith, or duress" to modify contracts under the public interest standard. Snohomish Reh'g Request at 37. In our June 26 Order, we recognized these criterion as three possible grounds to support a public interest finding, but in no way limited our inquiry to these three.

119 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 33 & n.117; 37-38 & n.137.

contracts. The cases on which Snohomish relies involve "extreme circumstances, such as the fundamental industry-wide restructuring under Order No. 888 and the reorganization of a bankrupt utility."[120] Contract modification here is, if anything, contrary to the Commission's policy of respecting contract sanctity and creating the regulatory certainty needed to attract sufficient capital to competitive power markets.

62. Indicated Sellers contend that we erred to the extent we relied in the June 26 Order on extrinsic evidence in determining that the public interest standard of review applies to the contracts at issue. Indicated Sellers seek clarification or rehearing that, unless contractual language preserves rights to make unilateral application to the Commission for changes in rates, the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard of review applies. We deny clarification or rehearing on that issue here. Complainants made clear that they "have not argued, or submitted evidence, to the effect that the absence of an explicit *Mobile-Sierra* provision in the [Dynegy and Sempra] contracts is itself a basis for not applying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard to those contracts."[121] Thus, Complainants conceded that "to the extent the *Mobile-Sierra* standard applies to the contracts with explicit

---

[120] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,383 (*citing Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open-Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Service by Public Utilities and Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities*, Order No. 888, *FERC Statutes and Regulations, Regulations Preambles January 1991-June 1996* ¶ 31,036 (1996), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-A, *FERC Statutes and Regulations, Regulations Preambles July 1996-December 2000* ¶ 31,048 (1997), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-B, 81 FERC ¶ 61,248 (1997), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 888-C, 82 FERC ¶ 61,046 (1998), *aff'd in relevant part sub nom. Transmission Access Policy Study Group, et al. v. FERC*, 225 F.3d 667 (D.C. Cir. 2000), *aff'd sub nom. New York v. FERC*, 535 U.S. 1 (2002); *Northeast Util. Serv. Co.*, 66 FERC ¶ 61,332, *reh'g denied*, 68 FERC ¶ 61,041 (1994)).

[121] *See* Partial Initial Decision at P 44 (*quoting* Complainants' January 14, 2003 Answer to Motion to Hold Briefing in Abeyance).

Mobile-Sierra provisions [the Mirant and Coral contracts], it applies to the contracts without such provisions."[122]

63. Next, Complainants claim that "it is against the public interest for the ultimate consumers to be burdened with contracts that impose unjust and unreasonable rates."[123] In Complainants' view, "[w]hen the subject rates are imposed directly on the public, unjust and unreasonable does mean contrary to the public interest."[124]

64. While Complainants have alleged that the contract rates currently exceed those available in today's markets, that allegation, even if true, does not establish that the contract rates are contrary to the public interest. Our precedent "makes clear that the fact that a contract has become uneconomic to one of the parties does not necessarily render the contract contrary to the public interest."[125] Additionally, even if the contract rates at issue

---

122 *Id.*

123 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 12.

124 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 72; *see also* Complainants' Reh'g Request at 17-18.

125 *PEPCO*, 210 F.3d at 409. Snohomish contends that the Commission erred in relying in its decision on *PEPCO* in which the court held that a showing of "a mere rate disparity or a benefit to the purchasing utility or its customers for a rate modification does not suffice, without more, to satisfy [the 'public interest'] standard." *Id.* at 404. In Snohomish's opinion, *PEPCO* and the instant case are factually different and thus *PEPCO* is inapplicable. In deciding whether the Complainants met their burden of proof under the public interest standard of review, we were guided by the court case law developed over several decades. Upon the review of the evidentiary record developed in this proceeding, the findings of the Staff Report, and evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding, we concluded that the challenged contracts were not contrary to the public interest because the Complainants failed to demonstrate that the contracts in question caused financial distress for the Complainants (or others they represent) so as to threaten their ability to continue service, that the contracts cast an excessive burden on customers, that the contracts were unduly discriminatory to the detriment of other customers that were not parties to this proceeding, or

will be passed through entirely to ultimate customers, Complainants have failed to show that would be contrary to the public interest.

65. We agree with Complainants that an important public interest is the interest in functioning competitive markets. In this proceeding, however, we have found that the record does not substantiate that the contracts in question caused financial distress for the Complainants (or others they represent), threatening their ability to continue service; that the contracts cast an excessive burden on customers; that the contracts were unduly discriminatory; or any other factors showing that modifying the contracts is required by the public interest,[126] and we have found nothing in the record, in the Staff Report, or in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding evidence to support a finding that there was market manipulation specific to the long-term contract negotiations resulting in the prices and terms challenged here.[127] Therefore, we find no merit to Complainants' contentions that our determination that modification of the instant contracts is not required by the public interest allows "market abusers [to] keep the benefits of high rates that their abuses helped bring about"[128] and "effectively declares that as between remedying unjust and unreasonable rates borne by the public itself resulting from circumstances involving seller misconduct...and allowing the same sellers to preserve the benefit of their unfair bargain, the latter is more in the public interest."[129]

---

that any other factors on the record of this proceeding demonstrate that the contracts were contrary to the public interest. June 26 Order at P 8.

[126] June 26 Order at PP 8, 39, 60.

[127] June 26 Order at P 61.

[128] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 16.

[129] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 22; *see also* Snohomish Reh'g Request at 35 (arguing that the Commission has elevated the interests of regulated utilities above the interests of electric consumers).

66. We also find no merit on the facts here to Complainants' argument that "the Commission should find it is in the public interest to modify contract rates that are 'so high' as to reflect exploitation of the buyer by the seller."[130] We have appropriately applied the public interest standard in this proceeding and found that Complainants have not met their burden of proving that the contracts cast an excessive burden on customers.

67. Complainants' contention that the contracts should be modified even if the rates burden customers in some degree less than excessive[131] is similarly inapposite. We have appropriately applied the public interest standard of review in this proceeding and found that Complainants have not met their burden under that standard.

68. We also reject Complainants' argument that our determination that reformation of the instant contracts is not required by the public interest conflicts with our application of the public interest standard of review in *El Paso Natural Gas Co.*[132] In *El Paso*, consistent with our holding here, we explained that "only in extraordinary circumstances, and only where the public interest so requires, will the Commission order contract modification. For example, the Commission has ordered contract modification in connection with its restructuring of the natural gas and electric industries."[133] Unlike in *El Paso*, where we found reformation necessary in the public interest because continued service under the existing contracts would continue the ever increasing degradation to firm service under those contracts contrary to the concept of firm

---

130 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 14.

131 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 14; see also Snohomish Reh'g Request at 36.

132 99 FERC ¶ 61,244 (2002) (*El Paso*); Complainants' Reh'g Request at 16.

133 *El Paso*, 99 FERC at p. 62,005 (footnotes listing citations omitted).

service and our regulations,[134] we have determined that Complainants have not shown that any public interest requires contract modification here.

69. Complainants make a number of arguments challenging our finding that CDWR had options and at least some bargaining power when it entered into the portfolio of contracts at issue here. First, Complainants argue that the available alternatives "were not those that would have been presented in the absence of spot market dysfunction."[135] Complainants' argument is not pertinent here. Complainants were required to meet the public interest standard of review, not the just and reasonable standard of review which could have taken into account the causal connection between the spot market prices and forward bilateral market prices.[136]

70. Moreover, Complainants' claim that "there is no evidence in the record—none—indicating that CDWR could have met the California net short at just and reasonable prices,"[137] improperly inverts the burden of proof here. Complainants, as the proponents of unilateral changes to *Mobile-Sierra* contracts, have the burden to show that the public interest requires contract modification. Thus, no one had the burden to establish that California's net short could have been met at just and reasonable prices.

71. Complainants' assertion that, because sellers had the choice of selling their power into the spot market rather than entering into long-term contracts with CDWR, CDWR lacked bargaining power and had to pay a significant premium to obtain the contracts at issue[138] fails as well. As the experience in California illustrates, sellers who choose to

---

134 *El Paso*, 99 FERC at pp. 62,003, 62,005-06.

135 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 21.

136 June 26 Order at P 37.

137 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 20.

138 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 49.

forego entering into long-term power sales contracts assume the risk that spot prices will decrease below the prices they could have obtained in those long-term contracts. Thus, both buyers and sellers have an equal incentive to avoid the price risks innate to spot market sales and to obtain the security long-term contracts provide.

72. Complainants also contend that the fact that CDWR received hundreds of long-term contract offers "does not establish that it had any meaningful bargaining power or that the contract prices were just and reasonable."[139] Our determination that CDWR had bargaining power regarding the contracts at issue was based on our consideration of all the factors discussed in the June 26 Order, not merely on the large number of bids received.

73. Moreover, Complainants claim on the one hand that "[m]any of the bids were mutually exclusive,"[140] and, therefore, by definition in competition with each other, while claiming on the other hand that CDWR "[was] not having proposals that were competing against each other."[141] In any event, that many of the bids received were mutually exclusive (or were for less than 100 MWs, or were made by unknown entities with no experience in the power industry)[142] does not negate the myriad other factors we found established California's bargaining power,[143] including that CDWR was able to assemble a portfolio of about 41 contracts for about 12,000 MW during the peak year.[144] And, while Complainants assert that "many of the offers did not start deliveries until after the summer of

---

139 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 49.

140 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 49.

141 Complanaints' Reh'g Request at 51.

142 Complainants' Reh'g Rrequest at 51.

143 *See, e.g.*, June 26 Order at P 43-59.

144 June 26 Order at P 49.

2001,"[145] all of the contracts at issue here provided for deliveries during that summer.

74. Complainants' attempt to cast CDWR as lacking bargaining power because, purportedly, the bids received reflected market dysfunction compared to cost-based pricing[146] fails as well. A disparity between market-based and cost-based rates is not sufficient to demonstrate a party's market power or lack of bargaining power.

75. Additionally, that CDWR purportedly made certain concessions regarding the terms of certain contracts[147] does not negate that CDWR was able to obtain many concessions from sellers, including obligating many, if not all, of the sellers to: (1) make immediate and/or near-term sales to CDWR at below-market prices; (2) assume transmission and congestion risk and provide high supply availability guarantees; (3) allow CDWR to dispatch the supplier's generation; (4) assume the risk of changes in fuel prices; and (5) provide CDWR the option of choosing seller-supply and/or CDWR-supply of natural gas.[148] In certain contracts, even though the sellers proposed a fuel price indexing formula, CDWR insisted on a fixed price, thereby

---

[145] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 51.

[146] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 51.

[147] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 51-54, 59-60. Complainants assert that CDWR agreed to a longer term than it wanted in the Sempra contract in order to foster Sempra's construction of new power plants, but that "Sempra claims that the contract does not require it to build any of the plants whose output CDWR was contracting for, and Sempra has aggressively asserted its right, in its sole discretion, to refuse to build such plants and to provide power purchased in the market." Complainants' Reh'g Request at 59. That assertion does not reflect on CDWR's bargaining power but involves a contract interpretation dispute that does not belong in this proceeding.

[148] June 26 Order at P 54 (*citing* Exh. COR-1 at 46:3-47:5; Exh. AYE-14 at 3:1-4:20; Exh. EPME-28 at 10:4-14; Exh. MAEM-1 at 13:5-18; Exh. MSC-1 at 6:16-7:2; Exh. SER-1 at 25:8-26:21; Exh. DYN-1 at 26:15-27:3).

leaving sellers to bear the risk that fuel prices would increase in the future.[149]

76. Complainants protest that CDWR's ability to contract for energy in 2001 at below market prices does not indicate that CDWR had bargaining power because "each of the contracts was priced above the then existing market forward price curve such that any below-market sales in 2001 were more than made up over the life of the contract."[150] That protest, like Complainants' earlier argument, inappropriately compares internally generated forward price curves to contract rates in an attempt to show that the contract rates are unjust and unreasonable or contrary to the public interest. As we explained above, internally generated forward price curves cannot be used to judge contract rates. For the same reasons, they cannot be used to show lack of bargaining power. Even if Complainants' assumption were correct, however, that does not diminish that CDWR was able to bargain and contract for energy at below market prices in the immediate and/or near term, when energy was critically needed.

77. Complainants assert that CDWR did not want ten-year contracts but wanted contracts with terms of one to three years. That assertion is belied, however, by the fact that CDWR's second request for bids did not indicate a preference for any particular contract term.[151]

78. And, while Complainants assert that CDWR did not achieve its purported goal of one-to-three year contracts with an average price of $70/MWh, CDWR did achieve a central objective of obtaining a portfolio of contracts that yielded a weighted average price no higher than $70/MWh, the average cost of energy supply reflected in the IOUs' retail rates as of January 2001.[152] That CDWR may not

---

149 *Id.* (*citing* Exh. S-1 at 25:8-11).

150 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 59.

151 June 26 Order at P 48.

152 June 26 Order at P 40.

have obtained the exact bargain it had in mind does not establish that it lacked bargaining power. Rather, it simply shows that the give-and-take innate to negotiation occurred.

79. Complainants also argue that the Commission erred in stating in the June 26 Order that "Complainants benefited from resales of the energy purchased under these contracts during the relevant period"[153] because, in Complainants' view, "there is no evidence in the record (and the Commission cites none) that Complainants (or even CDWR) benefited from the power sales."[154] In stating that "Complainants benefited from resales of the energy purchased under these contracts during the relevant period," we meant only that California benefited by entering into the contracts at issue because California was able to resell the power obtained under the contracts to meet California's energy needs. The record certainly supports that finding.[155]

80. We also find no merit to Complainants' argument that the dysfunction in the spot markets, the California Power Exchange ceasing operations and declaring bankruptcy, the bankruptcy and near-bankruptcy of two California investor owned utilities, and California "tak[ing] the unprecedented step of becoming the buyer for most of the load for the entire state," constitute extraordinary circumstances that satisfy the *Mobile-Sierra* standard.[156] Complainants have not shown that, on balance, the prices in the challenged contracts harmed the public interest as envisioned in *Mobile-Sierra*.

---

153 June 26 Order at P 8.

154 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 21.

155 Complainants' own rehearing request states that CDWR sought this outcome. Complainants' Reh'g Request at 49 (stating that CDWR chose to "purchase the electricity through long-term contracts and thereby reduce the reliance on the spot market and obtain a reliable supply at lower immediate cost.")

156 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 32.

81. Nor are Complainants correct that we did not consider the totality of the circumstances. In both the June 26 Order and here, we have considered the totality of the circumstances surrounding these contracts, including the California energy crisis and related events. Complainants have failed to establish, however, that any of those circumstances caused the contracts at issue to be contrary to the public interest.

82. Complainants' next contention, that the instant contracts "burden consumers with forward prices 33-60% in excess of a just and reasonable price," which constitutes an extraordinary circumstance satisfying the *Mobile-Sierra* standard,[157] fails as well. Complainants do not cite the basis for their 33-60% figure, and we know of none in this record. Furthermore, we have found that the Complainants failed to demonstrate that the contracts in question cast an excessive burden on customers.[158]

83. While Complainants argue that they demonstrated that the contracts were priced above long-run competitive prices, they base that claim on the testimony and evidence presented by Drs. Tabors and Stoft. We have found that testimony and evidence to be based on forward price curves that cannot appropriately be used for such a comparison. Complainants' other asserted evidence, the Staff Report, did not, contrary to Complainants' assertion, "find[] that forward prices in the 1-2 year class of contracts [were] unjust and unreasonable as a result of spot market dysfunction."[159] The Staff Report did not make any findings regarding the justness and reasonableness of any contract rates and any such findings would not be relevant here because the just and reasonable standard is not applicable.

84. Complainants' effort to diminish the impact of the fact that CDWR assembled a highly sophisticated

---

[157] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 32.

[158] June 26 Order at P 8, 39, 60.

[159] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 42.

procurement team to assist in its contracting decisions is unavailing. The procurement team's sophistication is part of the totality of the circumstances that informs our analysis of the public interest regarding the contracts in this case.

85. Despite Complainants' claims to the contrary,[160] comments by the California officials indicating that they fully supported the price, terms and conditions made contemporaneous with the contracts' execution are relevant, along with all other factors, to our determination of whether the instant contracts should be modified under the FPA. For example, a memorandum prepared by a member of California's negotiating team stating that "[e]ach power purchase agreement was the subject of often protracted negotiations. Frequently, sellers had to concede numerous points to obtain the terms and provisions they ultimately ended up with in the agreements,"[161] confirms that numerous concessions were made by sellers to obtain the contracts. Similarly, CDWR's lead negotiator's statement that "I can't get terribly upset by these critics who say oh, by gosh, this is higher than what the price might be. Well, hell, they don't know. We didn't just fall off a turnip truck. I am not saying we took the shirt off their back. But I am saying that these were fair, negotiated, hard-fought deals,"[162] corroborates that California's contracting team was sophisticated and engaged in fair and real negotiations.

86. Complainants' claim that they demonstrated bad faith, unfairness and duress by the respondents, proffering the "evidence in the Final Staff Report and 100-day submissions that the entire California energy crisis was caused in large part by the rampant and widespread market manipulation by numerous sellers, which led to the insolvency of the IOUs and in turn forced the California

---

160 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 56-57.

161 June 26 Order at P 50 (*citing* Exh. AYE-51 at NAV08-016238; Tr. at 1561:14-1562:18).

162 *Id.* (*citing* Exh. DYN-26 at 152:16-153:8).

public to enter the long term contracts through CDWR in order to avoid continued blackouts and stage 3 alerts."[163] Complainants' proffer does not suffice because, even if true, it does not show bad faith, unfairness or duress by any seller in the original negotiations of the contracts at issue as is required. Furthermore, the record evidence demonstrates that market fundamentals such as increased demand, reduced generation and increased fuel costs were variables that contributed significantly to the escalation in market prices.[164]

87. Snohomish argues that the June 26 Order suggests two contradictory tests for meeting the burden of proof under the public interest standard of review. According to Snohomish, these tests are the *Sierra* three-prong test and the requirement to show market manipulation specific to the contracts at issue, as well as "unfairness, bad faith, or duress

---

[163] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 63-64.

[164] Exh. MSC-7 at 5:15-6:3; MSC-7 at 8:12-9:12; Exh. AYE-1 at 13:1-9; Exh. MSC-7 at 11:20-12:4; Exh. MSC-7 at 9:15-10:6; Exh. MSC-7 at 10:7-12; Exh. MSC-7 at 11:6-9; Exh. COR-25 at 12:4-9; Exh. MSC-7 at 11:19-20; Exh. EPME-1 at 18:15-17; Exh. COR-25 at 11:6-13, 12:7; Exh. COR-25 at 18:12-22; Exh. EPME-1 at 28:13-15; Exh. COR-25 at 12:16; Exh. EPME-1 at 16:8-17:3; Exh. EPME-1 at 40:15-41:1; Exh. EPME-14A; Exh. EPME-1 at 21:6-11; Exh. MSC-7 at 59:3-16; Exh. COR-25 at 22:1-3; Exh. EPME-1 at 45:8-14; Tr. at 835:20-836:4; Exh. MSC-7 at 19:2-9; Exh. MSC-7 at 19:11-13; Exh. COR-25 at 15:16-17; Exh. EPME-1 at 18:5-14; Exh. EPME-3; Exh. COR-25 at 15:16-23; Exh. MSC-7 at 28:12-29:2; Exh. MSC-7 at 19:14-17; Exh. COR-25 at 23:19-24:6; Tr. at 839:8-9; Exh. COR-25 at 14:2-4; Exh. AYE/SER-1 at 16:7-15; Exh. AYE-1 at 17:3-10; Exh. MSC-7 at 37:15-16; Exh. COR-25 at 11:6-13, 14:6-25; Exh. MSC-7 at 41:6-12; Exh. MSC-7 at 43:10-13; Exh. COR-25 at 23:12-18; Exh.MSC-7 at 39:5-10; Tr. at 838:20-25; Exh. EPME-1 at 22:5-11; Exh. MSC-7 at 31:8-13, 31:16-20; Exh. MSC-7 at 33:8-16; Exh. EPME-56 at 1:11-18; Exh. COR-48 at 12:15-17; Exh. EPME-1 at 21:9-22:2; *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,121, at pp. 61,354-55, 61,358-59; Exh. S-2 at 7:6-17, 17:9-14. *See also* Oral Argument Transcript at 12:17-19 (May 15, 2003) ("We have recognized in our proceeding throughout, that there were underlying market fundamentals at work that created tight markets in California.").

during the original negotiations."[165] In the alternative, Snohomish argues that the contracts were the product of market manipulation.

88. We disagree. In the June 26 Order, we did not create two different public interest tests. Our statement that "there [was] nothing in the record, in the Staff Report, or in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding evidence to support a finding that there was market manipulation *specific to* the long-term contract negotiations resulting in prices and terms being challenged here"[166] was in response to the Complainants' contention that contract modification is warranted based on the Staff Report findings and the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding allegations of manipulation in the spot market. We reviewed the Staff Report findings and evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding and found no evidence supporting a finding of market manipulation that specifically affected the contracts at issue.

89. Snohomish also challenges the Commission's finding that "because there is no evidence of unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations, Complainants are not entitled to change CDWR's bargains."[167] Snohomish contends that the showing of unfairness, bad faith, or duress is not required to meet the public interest standard of review.

90. We disagree. In the April 25 Order, we instructed the ALJ to consider and the parties to submit evidence on "the totality of purchases and sales and the conditions present at the time the contracts were entered into."[168] As we stated in the July 23 Order, the instructions were tailored to "assist the judge in focusing on the main issue

---

[165] Snohomish Reh'g Request at 32-33, 37.

[166] June 26 Order at 61.

[167] June 26 Order at 62; Snohomish Reh'g Request at 37.

[168] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at p. 61,384.

that the hearing is intended to resolve."[169] Whereas "unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations" were not explicitly mentioned, such evidence could be relevant to the conditions present at the time of contract formation and whether the Commission should uphold or modify the challenged contracts. Moreover, as we stated in the July 23 Order, the list of evidentiary requirements was not exclusive; the parties were free to offer other evidence deemed by the ALJ to be relevant to the Commission-prescribed scope of the hearing.[170]

91. Furthermore, as Snohomish acknowledges in its rehearing request, the three-part *Sierra* "test" is illustrative and other factors can be considered.[171] We believe that a showing of fraud, duress, or bad faith between the parties at the contract formation stage could be an alternative ground for modifying the challenged contracts. Our review of a broader range of evidence concerning the circumstances surrounding formation of the contracts at issue imposed no harm on the Complainants. However, the Complainants failed to make this showing; they also failed to meet the *Sierra* three-prong test or demonstrate that contract modification is justified based on the totality of circumstances.[172] On rehearing, we also have fully considered and addressed all of Complainants' public interest claims. Our discussion of those claims in the June 26 Order and in this Order makes clear that we reject the claims because we find the claims do not satisfy Complainants' public interest burden.

92. Complainants also argue that the contracts should be modified because the requested remedy would allow every seller to recover all its legitimate costs, plus a reasonable rate of return, and that, in the extraordinary

---

169 July 23 Order, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098 at P 14.

170 *Id.*

171 Snohomish Reh'g Request at 32-34.

172 June 26 Order at PP 8, 39, 60-63.

circumstances here, that remedy would not create precedent that would impede contract formation in the normal course. We cannot subvert the mandates of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, however, absent demonstrated harm to the public interest. Complainants have not satisfied that burden here.

93. Complainants claim that the instant contracts must be modified to correct a lack of confidence in competitive markets caused by the energy crisis in California. Even assuming there is a lack of confidence in competitive markets caused by the energy crisis in California, Complainants are merely speculating, without making a supportive showing, that modifying the long-term contracts here would cure it. We find no basis for Complainants' speculative claim.

94. Next, Complainants and Snohomish assert that it is inconsistent and a disincentive for buyers to enter into future long-term contracts for the Commission to order refunds of unjust and unreasonable spot market rates but to deny modification of the contracts here. In making this assertion, Complainants ignore that these spot market sales are not subject to the mandates of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, while the long-term forward contracts at issue here are. Thus, while we are bound by a public interest standard in reviewing the complaint here, we are bound only by a just and reasonable standard in reviewing the California spot market sales. They also ignore that buyers can retain their rights to unilaterally file for rate changes under the just and reasonable standard by including a provision to that effect in their contracts. The latter fact also critically undermines Complainants' contention that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine can be construed as providing a disincentive for long-term contracting.

95. While Complainants protest that we have held them to an inappropriate burden of proof, contending that they only had to come forward with a *prima facie* case, the law is clear that the proponent of a unilateral change to a *Mobile-Sierra* contract has the burden to show that the public

interest requires that change.[173] We held Complainants to the appropriate burden of proof here. For this same reason, we reject Snohomish's argument that the burden of proof required in proceedings under Section 205 of the FPA is applicable here.[174]

96. In the background section of the June 26 Order, we noted that, in an April 25 Order,[175] we dismissed the complaints as to contracts entered into after June 20, 2001, the date on which our West-wide mitigation went into effect.[176] California (by Complainants CEOB and the California Public Utilities Commission) sought but was denied rehearing on that issue in the July 23 Order.[177] Complainants' renewal here of their objection to our holding in the April 25 and July 23 Orders is an improper collateral attack on those orders and is, therefore, dismissed.

97. Complainants are concerned that in the June 26 Order we did not address matters it raised that were set out in Appendix C of that order. In the June 26 Order, however, we considered those arguments and found them unpersuasive. Moreover, in this Order, we again have considered and discussed Complainants' arguments set out in Appendix C of the June 26 Order.

98. On rehearing, Complainants raise, for the first time, the argument that the ALJ erred by excluding the testimony of Stephen Sorey.[178] Complainants do not explain why they waited until after the June 26 Order was issued to raise for the first time on rehearing such a fundamental issue. The Commission generally looks with disfavor on parties raising on rehearing issues that should

---

[173] *Texaco*, 148 F.3d at 1096-97.

[174] Snohomish Reh'g Request at 30-31.

[175] April 25 Order, 99 FERC at pp. 61,383-84.

[176] June 26 Order at P 11.

[177] July 23 Order, 100 FERC ¶ 61,098.

[178] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 25.

have been raised earlier.[179] Such behavior is disruptive to the administrative process because it has the effect of moving the target for parties seeking a final administrative decision. Absent good cause, not present here, we will not consider Complainants' new argument raised for the first time on rehearing. Furthermore, since Complainants did not except to the ALJ's evidentiary ruling, its objections were technically waived under Rule 711(d)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.711(d)(2) (2003).

99. Moreover, even if we were to consider Complainants' new argument, we affirm the ALJ's ruling that this testimony was outside the scope of the proceeding because it related to a Sacramento Municipal Utility District long-term contract with Duke Energy Trading & Marketing, LLC not at issue here and thus should be stricken.[180] Furthermore, even if this evidence were included in the record, it would not change our decision. Complainants state that "Mr. Sorey testified that market participants at the time knew the spot market prices were inflated by dysfunction, expected such dysfunction to continue indefinitely, and specifically did not expect that the Commission's December 15 Order would eliminate the effects of such dysfunction."[181] These statements address the issue of whether there was dysfunction in the spot market, a fact not at issue in this proceeding. Therefore, it is not pertinent to our decision.

---

[179] *Tenaska Power Services Co. v. Southwest Power Pool, Inc.*, 102 FERC ¶ 61,140 at P 14 (2003) (*citing Baltimore Gas & Electric Company, et al.*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,270, at p. 61,922 (2000); *Northern States Power Company (Minnesota), et al.*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,172, at p. 62,522 (1993); *Cities and Villages of Albany and Hanover, Illinois, et al.*, 61 FERC ¶ 61,362, at p. 62,451 (1992)). *See also* Rule 711(d)(2).

[180] *See* Transcript of Prehearing Conference at 331:6-22 (October 30, 2002).

[181] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 25.

100. Complainants reassert their objection to the ALJ's exclusion of evidence of market manipulation.[182] We reiterate our finding that the ALJ properly interpreted the Commission orders on this issue and appropriately ruled to exclude the evidence.[183] Additionally, Complainants had the opportunity to present evidence adduced in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding[184] (California, by its Attorney General, and Complainants CEOB and the CPUC participated in the discovery process and submitted evidence in that proceeding) in which we allowed parties to conduct broad discovery into market manipulation during the western power crisis of 2000 and 2001. Contrary to Complainants' and Snohomish's assertions,[185] Complainants had a full opportunity in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding to conduct the discovery they complain they did not have an opportunity to discover here. We note that, while Complainants have only generally proffered the evidence submitted in that proceeding without pointing to or discussing any particular evidence for our consideration, in making our determination here we considered all of the evidence submitted in that proceeding.

101. After carefully considering all of the evidence submitted by Complainants in this proceeding, the Staff Report,[186] and the evidence submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding, we found that Complainants did not

---

182 Complainants' Reh'g Request at 25-26, 33-34.

183 June 26 Order at P 24.

184 *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Serv.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,186 (2002).

185 Complainant's Reh'g Request at 4, 34, 37, 61-62; Snohomish Reh'g Request at 37-38.

186 Complainants assert that we erred in acting on their complaints before Commission Staff completes its investigation into alleged market power and withholding by sellers. We find otherwise. This complaint proceeding is separate from the staff investigation. Nothing has been presented to show that it is necessary to hold our decision regarding the instant complaints until the separate staff investigation is completed.

sustain their burden under the public interest standard to justify the modification of these contracts.

102. There also is no merit to Complainants' claim that the June 26 Order is inconsistent with the April 25 Order. Complainants argue that in the April 25 Order "the Commission asked whether expectations of future dysfunctional prices inflated forward expectations so that the spot market dysfunctions could be said to have adversely impacted forward market prices, *invalidating those prices.*"[187] They contend that "[c]onfronted with such evidence now, the Commission draws the conclusion that such evidence somehow *validates the unjust and unreasonable forward prices.*"[188] Complainants' statement of our holding is incorrect. In the June 26 Order, we applied the public interest standard of review and found that Complainants did not meet their burden to justify modification of these contracts. Furthermore, in the June 26 Order, we explained that the causal effect of the spot market on forward bilateral prices would be relevant to contract modification only where the just and reasonable standard of review is applied.[189] Since the just and reasonable standard of review is not applicable here, that issue was not pertinent to our findings. Nothing in our determinations conflicts with our April 25 Order.

103. Complainants assert that, since they were wrongly prohibited from conducting any discovery concerning market manipulation and abuse, it is erroneous to exclude the evidence adduced in Docket Nos. EL01-10, IN01-3, EL02-113-000, EL02-114-000, EL02-115-000, EL02-80, EL02-81, EL02-82 and EL02-83 from the record in these proceedings. The Commission may reopen the record in its discretion where there is good cause.[190] The Commission

---

[187] Complainants' Reh'g Request at 27.

[188] *Id.*

[189] June 26 Order at P 37.

[190] 18 C.F.R. § 385.716 (2003).

views good cause as consisting of extraordinary circumstances, that is, a change in circumstances that is more than just material, but goes to the very heart of the case.[191] In deciding whether to exercise its discretion, "the Commission looks to whether or not the movant has demonstrated the existence of extraordinary circumstances that outweigh the need for finality in the administrative process."[192] As the Commission explained in Opinion No. 238, "we recognize of course that changes have occurred since the close of the record. But such changes always occur. Yet litigation must come to an end at some point. Hence the general rule is that the record once closed will not be reopened."[193]

104. Contrary to Complainants' assertion, Complainants had a full opportunity in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding to conduct the discovery into market manipulation during the western power crisis of 2000 and 2001 that they complain they did not have an opportunity to discover here. In the June 26 Order, the Commission found that the records of those other proceedings contain thousands of submittals, most of which are case-specific and not relevant to the issues in the instant proceeding and that the documents that could be relevant have been submitted in the 100-Day Discovery Proceeding.[194] The evidence that Complainants seek to introduce into the record will not change the outcome of this proceeding; therefore, we reject Complainants' argument.

---

[191] *CMS Midland, Inc.*, 56 FERC ¶ 61,177, at p. 61,624, *reh'g denied*, 56 FERC ¶ 61,361 (1991).

[192] *East Texas Electric Coop., Inc. v. Central and South West Serv., Inc.*, 94 FERC ¶ 61,218, at p. 61,801 (2001) (denying reopening of record where movant sought to use actual data which became available after the close of the record in place of hypothetical data used at hearing).

[193] *Transwestern Pipeline Co.*, Opinion No. 238, 32 FERC ¶ 61,009 (1985), *reh'g denied*, Opinion No. 238-A, 36 FERC ¶ 61,175, at p. 61,453 (1986).

[194] June 26 Order at P 34.

The Commission orders:

(A) The Complainants' and Snohomish's requests for rehearing of the June 26 Order are hereby denied for the reasons stated in the body of this order.

(B) The Indicated Sellers' request for clarification of the June 26 Order is hereby granted in part and denied in part for the reasons stated in the body of this order.

(C) CARE's request for rehearing of the June 26 Order is hereby denied for the reasons stated in the body of this order.

(D) The Complainants' motion to dismiss the complainants in Docket Nos. EL02-60 and EL02-62 with prejudice as to El Paso is granted, as discussed in the body of this order.

Commissioner Massey dissenting with a separate statement attached.

Commissioner Brownell concurring with a separate statement attached.

William L. MASSEY, Commissioner, *dissenting*:

I dissented from the underlying order and nothing in today's order persuades me to change my mind. The public interest requires that the contracts at issue be reformed.

For the reasons stated in my dissent in the underlying order, I dissent from today's order.

Nora Mead BROWNELL, Commissioner, *concurring*:

1. I am writing separately to reiterate a concern I raised about the June 26 Order: the rationale for concluding that modification of the contracts is subject to the public interest standard of review. When these cases were set for hearing, I noted that existing judicial case law seemed to indicate that the public interest standard applied to all of these contracts based solely on the contracts' failure to explicitly

reserve the buyer's right to seek unilateral changes under Section 206.[1] Nevertheless, I was willing to set the issue for hearing so that the parties and the ALJ could have an opportunity to further explore whether my understanding of the case law was accurate. Three ALJs have now independently come to the same conclusion: judicial case law establishes that in the absence of clear contractual language allowing unilateral contract modification, the party seeking the change must meet the public interest standard.[2]

2. This order could have simply affirmed the ALJ's conclusion on this point and ended there the analysis of which standard to apply. That is what I am voting to do. Unfortunately, today's order fails to do so and instead bases the finding of the applicable standard on an analysis of the extrinsic evidence that parties did or did not present at hearing. By doing so, the order ignores the law. The *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine is not an invention of the FERC that we are free to mold as we wish; it is a directive from the Supreme Court. Moreover, the order misses an opportunity to provide clarity and certainty to all market participants and leaves open the possibility that the Commission may order unnecessary fact-finding on the parties' intent in future contract abrogation cases.

---

[1] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long-Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources, et al.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087 (2002) (*citing Texaco Inc. v. FERC*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1096 (D.C. Cir. 1998) and *Boston Edison Co. v. FERC*, 233 F.3d 60, 67 (1st Cir. 2000)).

[2] *Public Utilities Commission of the State of California v. Sellers of Long-Term Contracts to the California Department of Water Resources, et al.*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,013 at P 28 (2003); *Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company v. Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C., et al.*, 101 FERC ¶ 63,031 at P 27 (2002); and *PacifiCorp v. Reliant Energy Services, Inc., et al.*, 102 FERC ¶ 63,030 at P 18 (2003).

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY WASHINGTON, Petitioner,

Reliant Energy Services Inc., Intervenor,

v.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION, Respondent.

Southern California Water Company, Petitioner,

Enron Power Marketing Inc., Intervenor,

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Respondent.

Attorney General, State of Nevada, Petitioner,

BP Energy Company; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, L.P., Intervenors.

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Respondent.

Nevada Power Company; Sierra Pacific Power Company, Petitioners,

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Respondent.

Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County Washington, Petitioner,

Calpine Energy Services, L.P.; El Paso Merchant Energy L.P.; Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP; BP Energy Co.; Allegheny Energy Supply Co., LLC; American Electric Power Service Corporation, Intervenors,

v.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Respondent.

Nos. 03-72511, 03-74757, 04-70712, 03-74617, 03-74208.

Argued and Submitted Dec. 8, 2004.

Filed: Dec. 19, 2006.

Before BROWNING, PREGERSON, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

BERZON, Circuit Judge:

The energy crisis in 2000-2001 resulted in extreme power shortages and price volatility in California and other western states. This consolidated appeal raises several interrelated issues concerning a series of wholesale energy contracts for future energy supplies—known as "forward" contracts—entered into by power companies in California, Nevada, and Washington during the energy crisis. Petitioners, including retail power companies and state agencies,[1] contended before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) that the contracts should be modified, but FERC concluded that they should not be.

---

[1] Petitioners are Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington (Snohomish); Southern California Water Company (Southern Cal Water); Nevada Power Company (Nevada Power); and Sierra Pacific Power Company (Sierra Pacific); and the Office of the Nevada Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection.

Petitioners (the "local utilities") now allege that FERC, in so deciding, did not appropriately apply the just and reasonable standard set by section 206(a) of the Federal Power Act (FPA).[2] They allege that FERC erred in applying the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" mode of review[3] to contracts that were (1) not subject to meaningful initial review or approval, and (2) formed during one of the most erratic and bizarre periods of activity for the western energy market.

We hold that FERC erred both in its procedural reliance on *Mobile-Sierra*[4] and in the substantive standard it used in determining that the contracts at issue did not affect the public interest. FERC's reliance on *Mobile-Sierra* was misplaced because its grant of market-based rate authority lacked a mechanism to provide effective, timely relief from unjust and unreasonable rates due to market dysfunction,

---

[2] Although the statute was amended slightly in 2005, this opinion exclusively refers to, and quotes from, the 2000 version. Section 206(a) provided:

> Whenever the Commission, after a hearing had upon its own motion or upon complaint, shall find that any rate, charge, or classification, demanded, observed, charged, or collected by any public utility for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or that any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affecting such rate, charge, or classification is *unjust, unreasonable,* unduly discriminatory or preferential, the Commission shall determine the *just and reasonable* rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and shall fix the same by order.

16 U.S.C. § 824e(a) (2000) (emphasis added). Notably, this provision expressly applied to "any ... *contract*," as well as to rates unilaterally set.

[3] This shorthand takes its name from two Supreme Court cases decided on the same day, *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.* (*Mobile*), 350 U.S. 332, 76 S.Ct. 373, 100 L.Ed. 373 (1956), and *Federal Power Commission v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.* (*Sierra*), 350 U.S. 348, 76 S.Ct. 368, 100 L.Ed. 388 (1956).

[4] We use the term "*Mobile-Sierra*" throughout this opinion to refer both to the two original Supreme Court cases and to the doctrine derived from them.

thereby creating a gap in the FPA's protection against excessive energy prices. Although we would remand to FERC solely because its application of *Mobile-Sierra* was therefore procedurally improper, we further hold that the agency's finding that the challenged contracts do not affect the public interest was based on a substantively erroneous mode of analysis. A remand is therefore necessary to allow FERC the opportunity to review these complaints in the first instance in light of these holdings and determine whether the challenged rates meet the statutory standard.

I. The Federal Power Act and *Mobile-Sierra*

The FPA governs the actions of public utilities, defined as "any person who owns or operates facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the [Federal Energy Regulatory] Commission." 16 U.S.C. § 824(e). The Commission's jurisdiction covers the "transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and the sale of such energy at wholesale in interstate commerce." *Id.* § 824(a). This definition encompasses activities carried out by all of the Intervenor-Respondent companies.

The FPA requires FERC to regulate public utilities for the benefit of consumers. *See Pa. Water & Power Co. v. Fed. Power Comm'n*, 343 U.S. 414, 418, 72 S.Ct. 843, 96 L.Ed. 1042 (1952) ("A major purpose of the whole [Federal Power] Act is to protect power consumers against excessive prices."); *California ex rel. Lockyer v. FERC* (*Lockyer*), 383 F.3d 1006, 1017 (9th Cir.2004) (describing "protecting consumers" as the FPA's "primary purpose"); *see also Atl. Ref. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 360 U.S. 378, 388, 79 S.Ct. 1246, 3 L.Ed.2d 1312 (1959) ("The [Natural Gas] Act was so framed as to afford consumers a complete, permanent and effective bond of protection from excessive rates and charges.").

Two FPA provisions, sections 205 and 206, 16 U.S.C. §§ 824d, 824e, govern FERC's authority and establish its obligation to regulate rates for the interstate sale and transmission of electricity. Through these provisions, the

FPA empowers FERC to regulate wholesale electricity rates but *not* the rates charged directly to consumers by local utilities. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 824(a), (b)(1). The protection the FPA accords consumers is therefore indirect: By assuring that wholesale purveyors of electric power charge fair rates to retailers, the FPA protects against the need to pass excessive rates on to consumers. At the same time, by assuring that wholesale purveyors of electric power receive a fair rate of return, the FPA assures that such sellers have the incentive to continue to produce and supply power.

The First Circuit has aptly described the interaction of sections 205 and 206:

> In regulating electricity rates, the Federal Power Act follows (with variations) a well-developed model: the utility sets the rates in the first instance, 16 U.S.C. § 824d(a), subject to a basic statutory obligation that rates be just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential, *id.* §§ 824d(a)-(b). FERC, which inherited the powers of its predecessor (the Federal Power Commission), can investigate a newly filed rate (section 205, *id.* § 824d(e)), or an existing rate (section 206, *id.* § 824e(a)), and, if the rate is inconsistent with the statutory standard, order a change in the rate to make it conform to that standard, *id.* §§ 824d(e), 824e(a)-(b).
>
> The procedural incidents and FERC's ability to provide refunds vary depending on whether the proceeding is one to investigate a new rate filing or an existing rate. For example, in the former case, the burden is on the utility to show that its rate is lawful, 16 U.S.C. § 824d(e), and, in the latter, the burden is on the FERC staff or the customer to show that the rate is unlawful, *id.* § 824e(b). In both circumstances, however, the statutory test of lawfulness is phrased in the same terms.

Boston Edison Co. v. FERC, 233 F.3d 60, 64 (1st Cir.2000) (footnote omitted). Additionally, when utilities set rates in the first instance, they may do so via privately-negotiated

contracts, filed pursuant to section 205(c)-(d), 16 U.S.C. § 824d(c)-(d).[5] Thus, the FPA, by its terms, creates a role for privately negotiated wholesale power contracts, balanced by FERC's obligation to ensure that those contracts rates, like unilaterally filed rates, are "just and reasonable."

Two Supreme Court decisions, announced on the same day in 1956, explain the approach that federal regulators must apply in certain circumstances when reviewing challenges maintaining that contracted rates are too low to be just and reasonable. *See United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Serv. Corp.* (*Mobile*), 350 U.S. 332, 76 S.Ct. 373,

---

[5] Section 205(c)-(d), 16 U.S.C. § 824d(c)-(d), provides:

(c) Schedules

Under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, every public utility shall file with the Commission, within such time and in such form as the Commission may designate, and shall keep open in convenient form and place for public inspection schedules showing all rates and charges for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and the classifications, practices, and regulations affecting such rates and charges, *together with all contracts which in any manner affect or relate to such rates, charges, classifications, and services.*

(d) Notice required for rate changes

Unless the Commission otherwise orders, no change shall be made by any public utility in any such rate, charge, classification, or service, or in any rule, regulation, or *contract* relating thereto, except after sixty days' notice to the Commission and to the public. Such notice shall be given by filing with the Commission and keeping open for public inspection new schedules stating plainly the change or changes to be made in the schedule or schedules then in force and the time when the change or changes will go into effect. The Commission, for good cause shown, may allow changes to take effect without requiring the sixty days' notice herein provided for by an order specifying the changes so to be made and the time when they shall take effect and the manner in which they shall be filed and published.

(Emphases added).

100 L.Ed. 373 (1956);[6] *Fed. Power Comm'n v. Sierra Pac. Power Co.* (*Sierra*), 350 U.S. 348, 76 S.Ct. 368, 100 L.Ed. 388 (1956). These decisions explain how, in the context of the energy industry as it existed in 1956, FERC was to ensure that wholesale contracts were "just and reasonable."

In *Mobile*, a seller agreed to a long-term fixed rate contract with another business, and the agency accepted it for filing under section 205. The Court held that the seller could not unilaterally increase a contracted rate by filing a new rate under section 205(d), reasoning that the statute "evinces no purpose to abrogate private rate contracts," *Mobile*, 350 U.S. at 338, 76 S.Ct. 373, and recognizing the need for "individualized arrangements" between suppliers and distributors, *id.* at 339, 76 S.Ct. 373. The Court emphasized that the public is served by the negotiation and enforcement of private contracts: "By preserving the integrity of contracts, [the Natural Gas Act] permits the stability of supply arrangements which all agree is essential to the health of the ... industry." *Id.* at 344, 76 S.Ct. 373. At the same time, the Court made clear that while "permit[ting] the relations between the parties to be established initially by contract," the Natural Gas Act provided for "the protection of the public interest ... by supervision of the individual contracts, which to that end must be filed with the Commission and made public." *Id.* at 339, 76 S.Ct. 373.

Sierra took up where *Mobile* left off, echoing the principle that a unilateral filing of a new rate cannot supersede a contract rate, even if the new rate is just and reasonable. *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 352-53, 76 S.Ct. 368. The Court then extended *Mobile* to section 206 cases, holding that when a public utility agrees "by contract to a rate

---

[6] *Mobile* related to the Natural Gas Act, and so did not involve a FPA claim. The Supreme Court, however, referred in *Mobile* to "the virtually identical provisions of the Federal Power Act," 350 U.S. at 346, 76 S.Ct. 373, and the doctrine derived from *Mobile* always has been understood to be fully applicable to FPA section 206(a) cases.

affording *less than a fair return*," then the "sole concern" of the Federal Power Commission (FERC's predecessor) in section 206(a) review is "whether the rate is *so low* as to adversely affect the public interest." *Id.* at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368 (emphases added). As the emphasized language indicates, *Sierra* dealt only with whether a challenged contract rate was too low to serve the public interest. It did not deal with a contract rate alleged to be too high. In these low-rate cases, the Court declared, "the purpose of the power given the Commission by § 206(a) is the protection of the public interest, as distinguished from the private interests of the utilities," as "a contract may not be said to be either *'unjust'* or *'unreasonable'* simply because it is unprofitable to the public utility." *Id.* (emphasis added).

Sierra thus did not purport to abandon the "just and reasonable" standard in the statute. Rather, it gave substance to that standard in circumstances in which the contention is that the seller of energy finds a long-term contract it entered into no longer profitable. Relying on section 201 of the FPA and reciting that "the scheme of regulation imposed by [the FPA] is necessary in the public interest," the Court held that when a seller seeks to raise rates after a contract has gone into effect, only "public interest" factors are pertinent to the "just and reasonable" inquiry, including whether the rate "might impair the financial ability of the public utility to continue its service, cast upon other consumers an excessive burden, or be unduly discriminatory." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

Mobile-Sierra, then, stands for the proposition that *in certain circumstances*, a presumption applies that private parties to a wholesale electric power contract have negotiated a "just and reasonable" contract over a designated period of time, lawful under the FPA throughout that period.[7] That presumption can be rebutted by

---

[7] The parties and some of the cases speak as if two alternative standards for reviewing wholesale electricity rates exist–the statutory

establishing that the contract adversely affects the public interest—that is, the interests of the consuming public that the FPA protects.[8]

As we explain in Part II of this opinion, *Mobile* and *Sierra* arose in a regulatory context in which there was an opportunity for traditional cost-based just and reasonable review before the energy contracts at issue became effective. The regulatory regime evolved, however, and FERC shifted its inquiry from the permissible cost-basis of rates to the determination of a seller's market power. We therefore confront here, for the first time, the intersection of *two* doctrines—one, the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, the product of the courts; the other, market-based rate authorization, the product of recent agency policy—as they affect the application of the just and reasonable standard. No case that we have found concerns the intersection of these two doctrines.

While the object of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine was an individual contract, the market-based rate authorization inquiry applies to an individual seller, with regard to any covered contract for electrical energy it enters into. The former inquiry occurred contemporaneously with a contract's formation, while the latter inquiry transpires before each contract is formed. This dual shift distinguishes

---

"just and reasonable" standard and the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard. We do not find this way of viewing the statutory terrain useful. The FPA establishes a single, albeit general, standard for FERC's adjudication of contract challenges like the present one: whether the challenged contract is "just and reasonable." 16 U.S.C. § 824e(a). The question therefore cannot be not whether the *Mobile-Sierra or* the "just and reasonable" standard of review applies. Instead, we understand *Mobile-Sierra* to establish presumptions regarding whether certain electricity contracts meet the statutory standard, and hold that lack of profitability alone is not a basis for deeming a contract unreasonable when the seller has agreed to the rate that proves unprofitable.

[8] As already noted, the specific factors mentioned in *Sierra* as rebutting this presumption apply to cases challenging a contract rate for being too low. *Mobile* and *Sierra* had no occasion to determine what factors must be shown in other situations.

the regulatory context here from that present in *Mobile* and *Sierra* in two material respects: (1) the *timing* of the agency's initial review has moved to a point *before* contract formation, and (2) the *substance* of that review no longer focuses on the *terms of the contract*. In other words, since *Mobile* and *Sierra* were decided, both the questions that FERC asks in its initial regulatory review of rates and when it asks them have changed.

Although this regulatory evolution does not render *Mobile-Sierra* a dead letter, it reinforces the need to delineate carefully the prerequisites for its application in the present environment. Our principal question is therefore whether the circumstances that trigger the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption are present in this case. As we explain in Part IV of this opinion, we conclude from the context of *Mobile-Sierra* and from later cases that three prerequisites are necessary to establish the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption: (1) the contract by its own terms must not preclude the limited *Mobile-Sierra* review; (2) the regulatory scheme in which the contracts are formed must provide FERC with an opportunity for effective, timely review of the contracted rates; and (3) where, as here, FERC is relying on a market-based rate-setting system to produce just and reasonable rates, this review must permit consideration of all factors relevant to the propriety of the contract's formation.

Taken together, the satisfaction of these three conditions justifies a presumption that parties have negotiated a contract that is just and reasonable between them and therefore triggers the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest mode of review, adjusted to account for the circumstance in which it is the buyer rather than the seller that is challenging the existing contract. When the prerequisites have not been met, however, the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption cannot apply, and FERC must find another method of evaluating whether the challenged rates are just and reasonable.

To explain the origins of these *Mobile-Sierra* prerequisites and illuminate the current role of the doctrine,

we begin by considering the historical and regulatory context in which *Mobile-Sierra* developed and the changes in that context since those cases were decided. We then turn to the facts and proceedings underlying the current dispute and, finally, to the derivation and application of the *Mobile-Sierra* prerequisites and standards.

II. Evolution Of Power Utility Regulation

A. Early Regulation of Utility Monopolies

Congress passed the Federal Power Act in 1920, establishing the statutory framework described above. Ch. 285, 41 Stat. 1063 (1920). This framework emerged from a wider body of state and federal regulation that revolved around the by-then "familiar mandate" that rates in various industries be "just and reasonable." *Verizon Commc'ns Inc. v. FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 477, 122 S.Ct. 1646, 152 L.Ed.2d 701 (2002).[9] Before Congress had passed many laws regulating national industries, state legislatures created specialized agencies "to set and regulate rates." *Id.* In the electric power industry, this effort began in the first decade of the twentieth century. By 1914, forty-five states had enacted electricity regulation laws. RICHARD F. HIRSH, POWER LOSS: THE ORIGINS OF DEREGULATION AND RESTRUCTURING IN THE AMERICAN ELECTRIC UTILITY SYSTEM 19-26 (1999).

The national government's first substantial foray into rate regulation occurred in 1887, with the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act. Ch. 104, 24 Stat. 379 (1887). This statute, primarily concerned with interstate railroad rates, formed "the model for subsequent federal public-utility statutes like the Federal Power Act." *Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 478, 122 S.Ct. 1646 n. 3. Under the Interstate Commerce Act, railroad carriers would first propose rate schedules,

---

[9] *Verizon* concerned the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which is not relevant to the present case. *Verizon* did, however, include a broader historical discussion of utility regulation, *see* 535 U.S. at 477-89, 122 S.Ct. 1646, that directly relates to energy regulation.

termed "tariffs." Then, interested parties could comment to the agency, which would accept the tariff so long as it was "just and reasonable." *Id.* at 478, 122 S.Ct. 1646.

The states and Congress applied this structure to the electric power industry on the basis of two widely-shared assumptions:

First, policymakers assumed that public utilities were "natural monopolies" because, among other reasons, it would be inefficient for competing utilities to string parallel power lines. Timothy P. Duane, *Regulation's Rationale: Learning from the California Energy Crisis*, 19 YALE J. ON REG. 471, 476-77 (2002). Also, utilities could benefit from economies of scale, making a monopoly more efficient than a competitive market. *See* HIRSH, *supra*, at 17-18.

Second, these monopolies, like any monopoly, would be tempted to abuse their market power. Moreover, because electricity cannot be stored, it needed to be produced at the same time consumers demanded it. Shortages anywhere on an interconnected electricity grid could threaten the entire system. The factors unique to the electric power industry made it particularly susceptible to abuse of market power: A local utility could withhold power, demand higher rates, and credibly threaten to disrupt a regional or national market. Regulation would keep local utilities in check. Duane, *supra*, at 477-78.

Early state and federal agencies created two categories of regulated rates: "retail rates charged directly to the public and wholesale rates charged among businesses involved in providing" the regulated good or service. *Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 478, 122 S.Ct. 1646. Under the FPA, the federal government regulates only interstate wholesale electric power sales and interstate electric power transmission, leaving to the states the regulation of rates charged to consumers. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 824(a), (b)(1). State and local governments, therefore, generally focused on rates "as between businesses and the public," while the federal government regulated rates "as between businesses." *Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 479, 122 S.Ct. 1646.

As a result of these differences in their regulatory focus, important differences in methodology developed between federal and state energy rate regulation. Knowing that state regulators focused on rates charged directly to the public and following Congress's "acknowledg[ment] that contracts between commercial buyers and sellers could be used in rate-setting," *id.* (citing section 205(d) and *Mobile*, 350 U.S. at 338-39, 76 S.Ct. 373), the Federal Power Commission (FPC) and, later, FERC—both bound by *Mobile-Sierra*—became less inclined to step in and alter filed rates charged among businesses in the energy industry. Even if those agencies wanted to change contract rates, courts, applying *Mobile-Sierra*, would generally assume that those rates were just and reasonable and would probably not harm the public interest. The underlying assumption was that "[i]n wholesale markets, the party charging the rate and the party charged were often sophisticated businesses enjoying presumptively equal bargaining power, who could be expected to negotiate a 'just and reasonable' rate as between the two of them." *Id.* The equal market power of those businesses and the role of state regulation of rates charged to consumers allowed the federal government to set a relatively high bar for proving that a wholesale contract was unjust or unreasonable based on impact on the public. Federal agencies, including the FPC and its successor agency FERC, thus saw their "principal regulatory responsibility" as preventing discrimination "by favorable contract rates between allied businesses" as compared to other businesses. *Id.* At the same time, *Sierra's* admonition that federal regulators *should* reform contracts if that was "necessary in the public interest," *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368 (internal quotation mark omitted), confirmed a continuing federal responsibility to review the impact of wholesale contracts on the public, even though the federal government did not directly regulate rates charged to consumers.

In contrast to federal regulators, state regulators "focused more on the demand for 'just and reasonable' rates

to the public than on the perils of rate discrimination." *Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 480, 122 S.Ct. 1646. In California, for instance, the Public Utilities Commission ensured that rates charged by the state's three primary utilities—Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison, and San Diego Gas & Electric—were just and reasonable to the consuming public. *See* C AL. CONST. art. XII, § 6; Duane, *supra*, at 480.

Within this two-tiered regulatory structure, case law developed an evolving definition of the "just and reasonable" standard. *See Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 481-89, 122 S.Ct. 1646. After decades-long debates not relevant here, courts and regulators settled on a system that attempted to match rates to the cost to the utility of providing the service, including "the cost of prudently invested capital used to provide the service." *Id.* at 485, 122 S.Ct. 1646. This "prudent-investor rule" was designed to provide incentives for utilities to invest in necessary capacity-building by allowing them to charge rates that would provide a fair rate of return on those investments while at the same time "protect[ing] ratepayers from supporting excessive capacity, or abandoned, destroyed, or phantom assets." *Id.* at 486, 122 S.Ct. 1646. These competing elements of cost of service regulation were intended to "mimic natural incentives in competitive markets." *Id.*; *see also Farmers Union Cent. Exch., Inc. v. FERC*, 734 F.2d 1486, 1510 (D.C.Cir.1984). As a result, cost of service regulation would, in theory, lead to the same rates that would exist in a properly functioning unregulated market.

B. Federal and State Regulatory Reform

Our description thus far covers the regulatory landscape through the mid-1990s. Beginning then, the electric power industry saw "complementary initiatives by the FERC and state agencies" to shift from a cost-based rate regulation regime to a market-based regime. Carmen L. Gentile, *The* Mobile-Sierra *Rule: Its Illustrious Past and Uncertain Future*, 21 ENERGY L.J. 353, 373 (2000).

This move toward energy regulation reform was premised on a new set of widely-shared assumptions:

First, cost-based regulation did not effectively check public utilities' market power. *See Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 486, 122 S.Ct. 1646 ("[T]he prudent-investment rule in practice often [was] no match for the capacity of utilities having all the relevant information to manipulate the rate base...."); Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities; Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities, FERC Order 888-A, 62 Fed.Reg. 12,274, 12,275 (Mar. 14, 1997) ("[A]bsent open access, undue discrimination will continue ...."); HIRSH, *supra*, at 33-54 (describing how "[u]tility [m]anagers [g]ain[ed] [d]ominance" within the earlier regulatory scheme). Also, local utilities would often deny competitors access to their transmission networks, protecting their monopoly status within a geographic area. *See Atl. City Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 295 F.3d 1, 4 (D.C.Cir.2002).

Second, with technological changes, public power utilities no longer needed to be monopolies. Technological innovations now permitted transmission of power over longer distances, allowing consumers to obtain power from beyond the geographic range of their local utility. *See Transmission Access Policy Study Group v. FERC*, 225 F.3d 667, 681 (D.C.Cir.2000) (per curiam) (upholding FERC's 1996 reform orders), *aff'd sub nom. New York v. FERC*, 535 U.S. 1, 122 S.Ct. 1012, 152 L.Ed.2d 47 (2002).

Third, the newly feasible market competition could drive down wholesale prices and measure the cost of service, including the cost of long-term investments, more accurately than did the previous regulatory regime. Competition, this thesis posits, "at least over the long pull," will lead to prices that "approximate [marginal] cost," including a return on capital sufficient to ensure that companies have financial incentives to provide power. *Interstate Natural Gas Ass'n of Am. v. FERC (INGAA)*, 285 F.3d 18, 31 (D.C.Cir.2002).

Based on these assumptions, FERC decided in 1996 to fundamentally reform its regulation of the nation's interstate wholesale electricity markets. FERC's orders implementing this electrical power reform, Orders 888 and 889, required each utility that operates transmission lines to allow any other utility in the interstate energy market to use its transmission lines on the same terms applicable to the operating utility itself.[10]

Transmission Access, 225 F.3d at 681-82; Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities; Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities, FERC Order No. 888, 61 Fed.Reg. 21,540, 21,541 (May 10, 1996). Taking advantage of the newly available "open access," utilities would, in theory, have both the market incentives and the legal right to compete with each other. This competition would provide retail consumers with the opportunity to purchase power from a wide variety of producers at relatively lower rates. *Transmission Access*, 225 F.3d at 683. A factory in Albany, California, for example, could, in theory, purchase power from a power plant in Albany, New York, no longer limited in its options to whatever the local utility would sell. Local energy utilities, could, rather than producing their own power to sell to the public, choose between various competing producers and then transfer the expected savings from this competition to the public. FERC estimated that, as a result of such competition, consumers would benefit from annual savings of $3.8 billion to $5.4 billion. Order 888-A, 62 Fed.Reg. at 12,276.

---

[10] According to FERC, open access is the first of "two central components." Order 888-A, 62 Fed.Reg. at 12,276. The second central component of the 1996 Orders is their mechanism for allowing utilities to recover "stranded costs," that is, costs which they incurred under the previous regulatory regime based upon an expectation of repayment that may not occur in newly competitive markets. *Id.*

A crucial element of FERC's 1996 "open access" reforms was the connection between "open access" and an "open access" utility's authority to charge whatever rates the market would bear. "[A]pproximately a decade ago, companies began to file market-based tariffs that did not specify the precise rate to be charged," and instead indicated that they would charge market-based rates. *Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1012. FERC would approve those tariffs if the public utility proved that it lacked, or had adequately mitigated, any ability to significantly affect market prices. *La. Energy & Power Auth. v. FERC*, 141 F.3d 364, 365 & n. 1 (D.C.Cir.1998); *see also Sw. Pub. Serv. Co.*, 72 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,208, at ¶ 61,966 (1995) (summarizing criteria for approving market-based rate tariffs). Such grants of market-based rate authorization were open-ended. *See, e.g., So. Co. Servs., Inc.*, 87 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,214, at ¶ 61,847 n. 3.

FERC's 1990s reforms specified open access as one criteria necessary to demonstrate the lack, or adequate mitigation, of market power. When a public utility implemented an "open access" policy, it demonstrated that it lacked market power regarding "sales from its existing [power generation] capacity" and was thus entitled to market-based rate authority—that is, the ability to charge whatever rates the market would bear—when it sold power over open access transmission grids. *See* Order No. 888, 61 Fed.Reg. at 21,553; *see Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1013 (describing FERC's test for granting market-based rate authority as "consist[ing] of a finding that the applicant lacks market power (or has taken sufficient steps to mitigate market power)"); *cf.* EDWARD KAHN, ELECTRIC UTILITY PLANNING AND REGULATION 319 (1991) (describing the *lack* of open access as allowing "market power [to] interfere with market efficiency").

FERC thus based its 1996 reform—and, as this case makes clear, much of its subsequent regulation—on the belief that "open access" would create market forces helping to ensure that no utility could exercise market power when

selling wholesale power. *See* Order No. 888, 61 Fed.Reg. at 21,554 ("[I]ncreased competition resulting from open access transmission may reduce or even eliminate generation-related market power in the short-run market ...."); *id.* at 21,555 ("[T]he Commission expects this Rule to facilitate the development of competitive bulk power markets...."). FERC tempered this expectation by promising to "continue our case-by-case approach" to granting market-based rate authority. *Id.* FERC's "case-by-case approach" includes ensuring that sellers seeking market-based rate authority lack, or have sufficiently mitigated, market power *and* that FERC has a sufficient "means of monitoring the market in which [the seller's] sales will take place." *Entergy Servs., Inc.*, 58 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,234, ¶ 61,753-54 (1992); *see also Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1016 (requiring a market-based regime to include "implied enforcement mechanisms sufficient to provide substitute remedies for the obtaining of refunds"); *Transwestern Pipeline Co.*, 43 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,240, at ¶ 61,650 (1988) (requiring a finding that "competition in the relevant markets will operate as a meaningful constraint on the exercise of market power"). Following the *Entergy* approach, FERC also promised to "modify our market rate criteria if and when appropriate," but specified that any such modification would "not upset transactions entered into pursuant to existing market-based rate authority." Order 888, 61 Fed.Reg. at 21,555.

Like FERC, California challenged the monopoly power of electric power utilities. California's efforts to foster competition between utility monopolies had begun after the energy crises of the 1970s. *See* Duane, *supra*, at 482-87. Federal law then allowed a "qualifying small power production facility" to compete in wholesale power markets. *See* Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, Pub.L. No. 95-617, §§ 201, 210, 92 Stat. 3117, 3134-35, 3144-47 (codified at 16 U.S.C. §§ 796(17)(C), 824a-3). California pursued these new options particularly aggressively so that, by 1991, California received a third of its energy from producers other than the monopolies held by local utilities.

HIRSH, *supra*, at 93. Those producers demonstrated that a utility could efficiently produce power without taking advantage of economies of scale that supposedly made electricity monopolies "natural." Through these reforms and market changes, the monopoly status of local utilities and the methodology of state regulation of monopoly utilities was eroding.

California A.B. 1890, passed in 1996, sought to accelerate this breakup of local utility monopolies by requiring them to divest a substantial amount of their electricity generation facilities. Act of Sept. 23, 1996, ch. 854, 1996 Cal. Legis. Serv. 854 (West). Local utilities also were required to sell power generated by remaining facilities to the California Power Exchange Corporation (CalPX), which was to serve as an auction market for wholesale electricity sales. *Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1008-09.[11]

C. Shifting Authority to FERC

When combined with federal preemption law, one crucial result of these energy market regulatory reforms has been "a massive shift in regulatory jurisdiction from the states to the FERC." Gentile, *supra*, at 373. As noted, a "bright line" exists between state and federal jurisdiction, with wholesale power sales—the type of sales at issue in the challenged contracts in this case—falling on the federal side of the line. *Nantahala Power & Light Co. v. Thornburg*, 476 U.S. 953, 966, 106 S.Ct. 2349, 90 L.Ed.2d 943 (1986) (quoting *Fed. Power Comm'n v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 376 U.S. 205, 215, 84 S.Ct. 644, 11 L.Ed.2d 638 (1964)). FERC's jurisdiction to determine the reasonableness of wholesale rates is exclusive. *Miss. Power & Light Co. v. Mississippi ex rel. Moore*, 487 U.S. 354, 371, 108 S.Ct. 2428, 101 L.Ed.2d 322 (1988). Prior to 1996, vertically-integrated state monopolies would charge public consumers rates regulated by state entities and would purchase power from interstate utilities at rates regulated by FERC. The 1996 FERC reforms

---

11 The details of A.B. 1890 are discussed below.

opened up local monopolies to competition among suppliers in the wholesale power market, resulting in a sharp increase in wholesale power sales—subject to FERC's exclusive jurisdiction—as utilities shopped among suppliers. *See* Gentile, *supra*, at 373; *Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1 v. Idacorp Inc.* (*Grays Harbor*), 379 F.3d 641 (9th Cir. 2004). Additionally, state regulatory reform laws, like California's A.B. 1890, resulted in a less active role for state regulators and a more active one for FERC, as the breakup of vertically integrated utilities created the need for many more wholesale transactions. In California, for example, regulators "ceded most of their authority for regulating generator or trader behavior to FERC through A.B. 1890." Duane, *supra*, at 507.

The upshot of these federal and state innovations in electricity regulation is that state regulators, despite their continued authority over rates charged directly to consumers, have much less actual authority over those rates than they did when *Mobile* and *Sierra* were decided. Local utilities now obtain power largely through wholesale contracts subject to FERC's exclusive regulation, rather than through self-generated and self-transmitted power. As a result, state regulators ordinarily must set retail rates with the wholesale rates as an established cost factor. FERC recognized this dynamic when issuing its reform orders, noting that customers will obtain more power delivered via "unbundled" wholesale transactions—in which the generation and transmission are separately traded rather than provided by an integrated local utility monopoly—making "[t]he exercise of our jurisdiction over rates, terms and conditions of unbundled retail transmission ... more important." Order 888-A, 62 Fed.Reg. at 12,279.

Accordingly, while the state and federal regulatory reforms of the 1990s did not end regulation of the electric energy industry, they did begin a new regulatory era. Although state regulators formerly took an extremely active role so as to ensure the just and reasonable retail power rates, FERC has exclusive jurisdiction over the

wholesale rates that now drive the electric power market and, as a practical matter, largely determine the rates ultimately charged to the public. These changes profoundly affect this case and require us to ensure that FERC's application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine reflects both the historical and regulatory purpose of the doctrine *and* contemporary regulatory reality.

With the history of electric rate regulation thus in mind, we now turn to the facts of the particular contracts at issue and then consider whether FERC applied the correct legal standard to review of these challenged contracts.

III. Factual and Procedural Background

A. The Western Energy Crisis of 2000-2001

This is not the first case, and it will not be the last, that requires this court to address the western energy crisis of 2000-2001, the basic facts of which are outlined elsewhere. *See Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 464 F.3d 861, 863-66 (9th Cir.2006); *Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Cal. v. FERC*, 462 F.3d 1027, 1035-46 (9th Cir.2006); *Bonneville Power Admin. v. FERC*, 422 F.3d 908, 911-14 (9th Cir.2005); *Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1008-11; *California ex rel. Lockyer v. Dynegy, Inc.*, 375 F.3d 831, 835-36 (9th Cir.2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 974, 125 S.Ct. 1836, 161 L.Ed.2d 724 (2005); *S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794, 800-01 (9th Cir.2002); *Duke Energy Trading & Mktg., L.L.C. v. Davis*, 267 F.3d 1042, 1045-46 (9th Cir.2001); *Cal. Power Exch. Corp. v. FERC* (*CalPX*), 245 F.3d 1110, 1114-19 (9th Cir.2001); *see also* Duane, *supra*, at 511-24; Michael A. Yuffee, *California's Electricity Crisis: How Best To Respond to the "Perfect Storm,"* 22 Energy L.J. 65, 65-84 (2001). Accordingly, we summarize here only those facts most relevant to this case.

As noted, in 1996, the California legislature deregulated the power industry in California through passage of A.B. 1890. The bill froze residential and small commercial

consumer retail rates[12] and required that the three largest California investor-owned utilities[13] divest most of their electricity generation facilities. *See CalPX*, 245 F.3d at 1114-15. Additionally, the bill created the CalPX, which operated a single-day auction for day-ahead and day-of trading in wholesale electricity, known as the "spot market." *Id.* at 1114.[14]

In the summer of 1999, CalPX also opened up a "forward market" to facilitate long-term wholesale electricity contracts. *Id.* The California Public Utilities Commission, however, allowed the investor-owned utilities to purchase only a limited amount of electricity from the CalPX forward markets. The great bulk of their load still had to be purchased from the CalPX spot markets. *Id.* at 1115.

In the summer of 2000, there was a dramatic spike in the price of wholesale electricity in the spot markets. *Id.* For example, "[t]he CalPX's constrained day-ahead price peaked at $1,099/MWh [megawatts/hour] on June 28, 2000—an astounding 15-fold increase over the pre-restructuring average cost of $74/MWh." *Id.* at 1115 n. 2.

On November 1, 2000, FERC issued an order explaining that, in its view, this dramatic increase was primarily the result of three factors:

First, "competitive market forces played a major role in the run-up of prices through significantly increased power production costs combined with increased demand due to

---

12 The legislature froze rates at a level utilities expected to be far above rates utilities were likely to have to pay, thus allowing them to recoup "stranded costs" as California's energy market shifted to a new regulatory era. *See* Duane, *supra*, at 501.

13 The three largest investor-owned utilities were San Diego Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG & E). *CalPX*, 245 F.3d at 1114.

14 The term "spot market" refers to deals for energy provided over periods generally not exceeding 24 hours and entered into the day of or day prior to delivery. It contrasts with the term "forward market," in which energy is delivered some time beyond 24 hours after the sale.

unusually high temperatures and a scarcity of available generation resources throughout the West and California in particular." *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 93 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,121, at ¶ 61,354, 2000 WL 1637060 (2000).

Second, "[m]any of the market dysfunctions in California and the exposure of California consumers to high prices can be traced directly to an over reliance on spot markets." *Id.* ¶ 61,359. The rules requiring investor-owned utilities to purchase primarily through the spot markets precluded any significant reliance on forward markets. "And other retail suppliers who would have been free to implement appropriate risk management strategies could not be induced to participate in California's market because the low retail rate, frozen at 10 percent below historical levels, thwarted competitive opportunities for new participants to enter the market." *Id.*

Third, FERC suggested that there was the opportunity for abuse of the markets through the exercise of market power, but could not point to specific instances. *Id.* ¶ 61,376. FERC's staff later issued a report concluding that the spot market was dysfunctional, partially due to market manipulation by sellers; that conclusion is assumed by all parties here. *See* STAFF OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION, FINAL REPORT ON PRICE MANIPULATION IN WESTERN MARKETS: FACT-FINDING INVESTIGATION OF POTENTIAL MANIPULATION OF ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS PRICES ["Staff Report"] (2003), *available at* www.ferc.gov/legal/maj-ord-reg/land-docs/PART-I-3-26-03.pdf.

California is part of a single integrated electricity market in the West. Its energy problems therefore created a "dysfunctional marketplace both in California and the remainder of the West." *See San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.* (*June 19 Order*), 95 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,418, at ¶ 62,556, 2001 WL 1910052 (June 19, 2001). For example, in the Pacific Northwest, prices have historically averaged approximately $24/MWh. During this period, short term prices spiked to

unprecedented levels, peaking at $3,300/MWh in early December of 2000, and during the summer and fall of 2000 averaged between $200/MWh and $500/MWh. Markets were also marked by unprecedented levels of price volatility. In response to this volatility, between August 2000 and December 19, 2001, FERC issued nearly 75 orders providing for spot market mitigation measures, *see, e.g., id.*, most aimed at reducing the size of the spot market. *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 97 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,275, at ¶ 62,171 (Dec. 19, d2001).

The order issued on December 15, 2000, is of particular relevance to the issues here. *See San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.* (*December 15 Order*), 93 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,294, 2000 WL 1840337 (Dec. 15, 2000). That order strongly urged investor-owned utilities to move to long-term contracts of two years or more. *Id.* ¶ 61,993. "To address concerns about potentially unjust and unreasonable rates in the long-term markets," FERC agreed to "monitor prices in those markets" and established a "benchmark" rate of $74/MWh to "use as a reference point in addressing any complaints regarding the pricing of long-term contracts negotiated over the next year." *Id.* ¶ 61,994-95. In response to the contention that such a shift would only transform the forward market into another strong sellers' market resembling the then-dysfunctional spot market, FERC declared that it would "be vigilant in monitoring the possible exercise of market power" in the forward market. *Id.* ¶ 61,994. FERC's monitoring, the agency promised, would "also provide customers protection by providing early review of as-bid prices that may not be just and reasonable and prompt rate relief for prices that are mitigated." *Id.* ¶ 61,997.

B. Contracts at Issue Here

This consolidated appeal involves three separate sets of contracts, all of which were made pursuant to the Western Systems Power Pool Agreement (Power Pool Agreement), an umbrella agreement that established standardized terms

for wholesale energy transactions. All the utilities involved in this case are signatories to that agreement.

1. *Snohomish*

In response to the extreme spike of spot market prices (reaching as high as $3,300/MWh) during December 2000, Snohomish, a public utility for Snohomish County in Washington, determined that it was no longer viable to rely on the spot markets. On December 22, 2000, Snohomish issued a request for proposals to 17 power suppliers, seeking bids for one-to-three year contracts, providing a total of approximately 75-100 megawatts of electricity for 2001.

Snohomish received five bids, but two were unresponsive to Snohomish's needs. Of the three responsive bids, no supplier would offer more than 25 MW, so Snohomish accepted all three bids and negotiated contracts with each supplier.[15] That year, Snohomish's Board of Commissioners had previously approved an unprecedented thirty-five percent increase in retail rates, allowing for an average contract price of $125/MWh. Unfortunately, none of the three offers would allow Snohomish to meet this price, and Snohomish chose not to ask its ratepayers for another double-digit rate increase in the same year.

Consequently, Snohomish asked Morgan Stanley—an electrical energy commodities dealer—what term would be necessary to secure a $100/MWh price for its contract; Morgan Stanley demanded a ten-year term. The parties ultimately agreed to a nine-year term at $105/MWh. Additionally, Morgan Stanley required Snohomish to accept credit terms articulated in a contractual provision termed the "Collateral Annex."[16]

---

[15] One of the three contracts, signed with Enron Corporation, was terminated in November 2001, as Enron's credit deteriorated. Snohomish sought reform of the other contract, with American Electric Power, and the parties settled that case. The remaining contract, here at issue, is with Morgan Stanley Capital Group ("Morgan Stanley").

[16] Among other requirements, the "Collateral Annex" required Snohomish to post, on two days notice, specified

Snohomish claims that it suffered losses between January 2001 and March 2002 in excess of $25.7 million and that those losses will escalate over the term of the contract as market rates remain close to traditional levels. FERC specifically found that the Morgan Stanley contracts accounted for an eight percent increase for retail ratepayers over 2001 rates, and other contracts accounted for a fifty-one percent increase. *Nev. Power Co.* (*November 10 Order*), 105 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,185, at ¶ 61,986, 2003 WL 22628184 (Nov. 10, 2003). Snohomish here challenges the term of the contract and the imposition of the Collateral Annex.

2. *Southern Cal Water*

Southern Cal Water owns and operates an electric utility distribution system that serves approximately 21,600 customers in San Bernadino County, California. Southern Cal Water purchases, subject to regulation by the California Public Utilities Commission, an average electric load of about 16.3 MW.

The A.B. 1890 requirements that investor-owned utilities purchase in the spot market did not apply to Southern Cal Water, which owned no transmission lines and generated no electricity. To avoid relying entirely on the spot markets, which it viewed as significantly risky, Southern Cal Water executed a one-year contract with Illinova in April 1999, providing for purchase of 12 MW of uninterruptible around-the-clock energy at a price of $28/MWh. One year later, Southern Cal Water renewed the contract with Dynegy (Illinova's successor), to run from May 1, 2000, to May 1, 2001, for the same load, at the increased price of $35.50/MWh.

California enacted A.B. 1 on February 1, 2001, allowing the California Department of Water Resources to purchase energy for the then-collapsing large investor-owned utilities and power suppliers. *See* Act of Feb. 1, 2001, 2001 Cal. Legis. Serv. 1st Ex.Sess. 4 (West). At that point, Dynegy

---

collateral. This requirement has required Snohomish to post as much as $101 million in collateral.

informed Southern Cal Water that it was not interested in renewing its contract with Southern Cal Water, because it could sell its entire generation output to the State of California. With the present contract expiring at the end of April 2001, Southern Cal Water engaged in a hurried bidding process.[17]

On March 7, 2001, Southern Cal Water issued a request for proposals for 15 MW of power to six power companies operating in California and requested bids by March 14, 2001. The company requested bids of one to seven years, without specifying a preferred or maximum price. The three bids submitted ranged from $194.50/MWh for a one-year contract to $84/MWh for a seven-year contract. After receiving firm offers at higher prices, Southern Cal Water accepted Mirant's offer of $95/MWh for five years, as the offer that best balanced price against contract length. In light of this increase in Southern Cal Water's wholesale electricity costs, the California Public Utilities Commission allowed the company to recover a portion of the costs of the contract, resulting in a weighted average retail rate of $77/MWh.

Southern Cal Water maintains that its ratepayers have seen an overall thirty-eight percent increase in their electric bills. FERC found that there was no rate increase for Southern Cal Water's ratepayers who are permanent residents, and that the other group of Southern Cal Water ratepayers, those with second homes in certain areas, paid

---

[17] Noting that, in October 2000, Southern Cal Water rejected an offer by Dynegy to extend its contract on a "blend and extend" basis of between $46.50/MWh to $54.50/MWh depending on the length of the proposed contract, *Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,988 (internal quotation marks omitted), FERC found that Southern Cal Water *chose* to wait until March 2001 to solicit bids. This statement is misleading. Southern Cal Water could only have become aware that Dynegy would not renew its contract on any terms because of the disincentive to doing so created by A.B. 1 after that law was passed, which was in February of 2001. As noted above, it was Dynegy's pullout that induced Southern Cal Water's frenzied bidding process.

an average monthly electric bill of only $35.13. *Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,986.

3. *Nevada Power Companies: Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific*

The challenge brought by Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific seeks to modify over two hundred forward market contracts with various energy sellers for supply of 25-100 MW blocks of power.[18] These contracts range in price from $33/MWh to $290/MWh, and were entered into in 2000-2001 with ten energy companies. FERC found that these contracts were standard products arranged through independent third-party brokers, and concluded that Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific were price-takers, meaning that those utilities took the price the market yielded rather than bargaining or demanding a certain price. *Nev. Power Co.* (*June 26 Order*), 103 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,353, at ¶ 62,398, 2003 WL 21485862 (June 26, 2003). According to FERC, the Nevada companies did not pursue purchase of a diverse mix of products and therefore failed to hedge the risk that spot market prices might fall. *Id.*

FERC also found that the Nevada companies pursued an aggressive procurement strategy, purchasing more power than necessary to serve the expected load of their local customers. *Id.* FERC suggests that the Nevada companies were trying to buy as much power as they could before sellers discovered their precarious financial situation. *Id.*

FERC found that if these contracts are not modified, the resulting increase to ratepayers would be no more than five percent. *Id.* ¶ 62,397. The Nevada companies recognize that the retail rates have decreased since they agreed to the challenged contracts, but they maintain that Nevada customers will still pay significantly more than they would

---

[18] The Nevada companies recently settled their disputes with Morgan Stanley, El Paso Merchant Energy, and Enron Power Marketing. These settlements have no bearing on the legal issues we address.

pay if the contracts were modified to reflect just and reasonable rates. *Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,986. Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific therefore seek to modify their contracts with the energy sellers. *Nev. Power Co.* (*April 11 Order*), 99 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,047, at ¶ 61,185, 2002 WL 32126219 (Apr. 11, 2002). Nevada Power is seeking relief for contracts that had not yet gone to delivery at the refund effective dates set by FERC (between late January and April of 2002, depending on docket number).[19] *Id.* ¶¶ 61,185, 61,192.

C. Agency Proceedings

The agency actions challenged here arise from a series of orders issued by FERC with regard to the complaints filed by the local utilities.

1. *Order Setting the Local Utilities' Complaints for Hearing (April 11 Order)*

On April 11, 2002, pursuant to section 206 of the FPA, FERC set a hearing concerning the contracts "entered into during the time period from November 1, 2000 through June 20, 2001, and that have not yet concluded," because FERC has "no authority to order refunds for contracts or transactions that conclude prior to the refund effective date." *Id.* ¶ 61,191 (footnote omitted). FERC also set refund effective dates for each of the complaints. *Id.* ¶ 61,192.

FERC explained in its April 2002 order that it did not have enough information yet to address the *Mobile-Sierra* issues definitively. The agency clarified that "[f]or all but one of the contracts identified by the complainants, Section

---

19 Upon setting a section 206 complaint for hearing, FERC establishes a "refund effective date," which is a date establishing the period from which complainants may attain relief should the proceedings extend beyond that established date. In other words, if a party makes a complaint on January 1, 2004, but FERC does not set the complaint for hearing until July 1, 2004, FERC may establish a "refund effective date" of March 1, 2004, so that the complainant will not suffer from the agency's delay or from continued agency proceedings.

6.1 of the umbrella [Power Pool] agreement appears to be the only specific contractual provision which may affect parties' rights to make changes to contracts." *Id.* § 61,190. The remaining contract, between PUD and Morgan Stanley, has a separate provision addressing both FPA sections 205 and 206. *Id.* ¶ 61,190 & n. 11. FERC also noted a key dispute between the parties: whether the "spot markets had an adverse effect on the long-term, bilateral markets in California, Nevada and Washington." *Id.* ¶ 61,191. The hearing, designed to illuminate these questions, was to address "whether the dysfunctional California spot markets adversely affected the long-term bilateral markets, and, if so, whether modification of any individual contract at issue is warranted." *Id.* (footnote omitted). FERC specifically excluded "issues concerning the Commission's policies on granting market-based rate authority or on regulation of sellers with such authority." *Id.*

2. *Initial Decision of the Administrative Law Judge (Initial Decision)*

On December 19, 2002, after an extensive hearing, Administrative Law Judge Carmen Cintron issued a lengthy initial decision on the complaints. *Nev. Power Co.*, 101 F.E.R.C. ¶ 63,031, 2002 WL 31889939 (Dec. 19, 2002). She ultimately concluded that (1) the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard is the applicable standard of review, *id.* ¶ 65,277, and (2) the complainants failed to demonstrate that the spot market sufficiently adversely affected the forward market to merit revision of the contracts under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, *id.* ¶ 65,295.

3. *Order on Initial Decision*

On June 26, 2003, FERC issued a lengthy opinion in which it affirmed the Initial Decision. *Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,400. FERC's primary findings included: (1) Section 6.1 of the Power Pool agreement's express reservation of joint modification under section 205 of the FPA impliedly waived the right to seek unilateral modification, *id.* ¶ 62,388; (2) this waiver meant

that review was limited to the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard, *id.* ¶¶ 62,388-89; (3) applying the three factors articulated in *Sierra* and considering "the totality of the circumstances," complainants failed to meet the "public interest" standard because "[t]he fact that a contract becomes uneconomic over time does not render it contrary to the public interest," *id.* ¶ 62,384; and (4) the totality of the circumstances evidence analyzed by the ALJ further demonstrated that "the challenged transactions were the result of [the local utilities'] voluntary choices," and there was "no evidence of unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations," *id.* ¶¶ 62,399-62,400. Because modification was therefore not warranted, FERC denied the complaints. *Id.* ¶ 62,400.

Although FERC acknowledged that it had set the ALJ hearing in large part to decide "whether the dysfunctional California ISO and PX spot markets adversely affected Western long-term bilateral markets," *Id.* ¶ 62,385, FERC concluded that evidence showing the spot market's effect on the forward market—including that reviewed in the Staff Report[20]—"would be relevant to contract modification only where there is a 'just and reasonable' standard of review." *Id.* ¶ 62,397. FERC further explained, applying the *Mobile-Sierra* public interest standard, that "to justify contract modification it is not enough to show that forward prices became unjust and unreasonable due to the impact of spot market dysfunctions; it must be shown that the rates, terms, and conditions are contrary to the public interest," a showing the local utilities failed to make. *Id.*

Commissioner Massey issued a vigorous dissent, disagreeing with all of the Commission's major findings and analysis. He explained that "[o]ur primary calling under the

---

20 FERC at first stated that it "t[ook] into consideration the findings of the Staff Report," *Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,396, but later stated its conclusion that those findings were not "relevant" under *Mobile-Sierra*, the standard FERC determined appropriate. *Id.* ¶ 62,397.

Federal Power Act is to ensure that prices are just and reasonable 24 hours a day, seven days a week." *Id.* ¶ 62,403 (Massey, Comm'r, dissenting). Furthermore, even under a "public interest" standard, which he maintained was not applicable to these contracts, Commissioner Massey determined there was

> simply no persuasive public interest rationale for protecting and sanctifying contracts negotiated in this unprecedented and extraordinary environment. ... It would simply defy logic to conclude that the high prices in these contracts were not adversely influenced by market conditions that included the exercise of market power and widespread market manipulation.

Id. ¶ 62,408.

4. *Order on Requests for Rehearing and Clarification*

Complainants applied for rehearing. On November 10, 2003, FERC reaffirmed its previous holdings. *Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,980. FERC, however, revised its previous factual findings to recognize that the customers of Snohomish and Southern Cal Water did experience a retail rate increase. FERC concluded, however, that these increases either were not significant or were not pertinent, because the local utilities did not prove the cause of the increases. *Id.* ¶¶ 61,986-87. FERC also rejected petitioners' claims that two of the Commissioners violated procedural requirements and the Sunshine Act by engaging in ex parte communications. *Id.* ¶¶ 61,991-94. The local utilities then filed this petition for review of FERC's decision.

We review FERC's orders to ensure that they are not "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). We review de novo the question whether FERC complied with and understood its statutory mandate. *City of Fremont v. FERC*, 336 F.3d 910, 914 (9th Cir.2003); *Am. Rivers v. FERC*, 201 F.3d 1186, 1194 (9th Cir.1999). We "defer to the

Commission's interpretations of the statutory provisions it administers, but we remain 'the final authority on issues of statutory construction and must reject administrative constructions which are contrary to clear congressional intent.'" *Am. Rivers*, 201 F.3d at 1194 (quoting *Natural Res. Def. Council v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior*, 113 F.3d 1121, 1124 (9th Cir.1999)). FERC's factual findings are conclusive so long as they are "supported by substantial evidence." 16 U.S.C. § 825*l* (b).

IV. Prerequisites To Applying *Mobile-Sierra*

As explained above, there is but one statutory standard addressing the lawfulness of wholesale electricity rates. That standard requires that *all* rates be "just and reasonable." While there is language in some cases suggesting otherwise,[21] we are convinced that *Mobile-Sierra* establishes one means of review under the just and reasonable standard, applicable in certain limited circumstances. The statute will admit of no other conclusion, and the Supreme Court case law supports it.

Sierra framed its analysis as a determination as to whether the Federal Power Commission met its "condition precedent" to a section 206 remedy, a "finding that the existing rate is 'unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential.'" 350 U.S. at 353, 76 S.Ct. 368. It then faulted the Commission's finding that the established rate was invalid *not* because it applied the usual section 206(a) "unreasonable" standard, but because "the Commission holds that the contract rate is unreasonable solely because it yields less than a fair return on the net invested capital." *Id.* at 354-55, 76 S.Ct. 368. As the *Sierra* Court explained,

> [W]hile it may be that the Commission may not normally *impose* upon a public utility a rate which would produce

---

21 *Boston Edison Co.*, 233 F.3d at 65, for example, refers to *Mobile-Sierra* as establishing a "public interest standard," separate from the statutory just and reasonable requirement, and referring to that standard as having been "created out of whole cloth."

> less than a fair return, it does not follow that the public utility may not itself agree by contract to a rate affording less than a fair return or that, if it does so, it is entitled to be relieved of its improvident bargain .... [T]he purpose of the power given the Commission by § 206(a) is the protection of the public interest, as distinguished from the private interests of the utilities .... When § 206(a) is read in the light of this purpose, it is clear that a contract may not be said to be either 'unjust' or 'unreasonable' simply because it is unprofitable to the public utility.

Id. at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368. *Sierra*, then, simply held that considerations as to what is "unjust" or "unreasonable" differ in the context of an established bilateral contract, not that the statutory standards no longer govern. The Supreme Court confirmed this understanding in *Verizon*, explaining that "[i]n wholesale markets, the party charging the rate and the party charged were often sophisticated businesses enjoying presumptively equal bargaining power, who could be expected to negotiate a 'just and reasonable' rate as between the two of them." 535 U.S. at 479, 122 S.Ct. 1646.

Beginning with that understanding of *Mobile-Sierra*, we turn to the limited circumstances in which its presumption applies. Although no case has outlined these conditions succinctly, we derive three prerequisites from the context of *Mobile-Sierra* and from later cases employing the doctrine.

A. Contractual Waiver

As an initial matter, the contested contract by its own terms must not preclude the limited *Mobile-Sierra* mode of review. *See Texaco Inc. v. FERC (Texaco II)*, 148 F.3d 1091, 1096 (D.C.Cir.1998); *Ne. Utils. Serv. Co. v. FERC (Ne.Utils.I)*, 993 F.2d 937, 960 (1st Cir.1993). *Mobile-Sierra* presumes that private parties have negotiated an agreement that they view as just and reasonable over the time period covered. If, by the very terms of their

agreement, the parties indicate otherwise, FERC cannot assume the mutual satisfaction of the parties.

For example, parties can include in a contract an express reservation of a right to make changes unilaterally, known as a "*Memphis* clause." *See United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div.*, 358 U.S. 103, 105, 112, 79 S.Ct. 194, 3 L.Ed.2d 153 (1958). Such a clause will preclude application of the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption. The rationale for enforcing such clauses is that if the contract does not settle rates as between the parties for the term of the agreement or call for limited, *Mobile-Sierra* review, then application of *Mobile-Sierra* does not stabilize or protect the sanctity of contract. *See id.* at 112, 79 S.Ct. 194 (noting that the "decisive difference" between *Memphis* and *Mobile* was that "in *Mobile* one party to a contract was asserting that the Natural Gas Act somehow gave it the right unilaterally to abrogate its contractual undertaking, whereas here petitioner seeks simply to assert, in accordance with the procedures specified by the Act, rights *expressly reserved* to it by contract") (emphasis added). In other words, *Mobile-Sierra* serves to protect contracts from unilateral change, but that purpose is not served when the parties expressly have permitted such change.

B. Regulatory Context

Even if it is established that the parties contracted with the intent that *Mobile-Sierra* apply, a further barrier remains: The regulatory context in which the contracts were initially formed must provide a sound basis to believe that the resulting rates are just and reasonable. Absent such assurances, FERC's reliance on the presumption would amount to a complete abdication of its statutory responsibility under the FPA. As the following sub-sections explain, two related conditions operate to ensure that a foundation for the presumption exists: (1) timely and procedurally effective review of rates—which in the contemporary regulatory regime can be limited to review of a utility's market-based rate authority in the first instance,

and (2) meaningful substantive standards for review of the circumstances of contract formation.

1. *Timely and Effective Review of Rates*

To justify the *Mobile-Sierra* mode of review, the regulatory scheme in which the contracts are formed must provide FERC with an opportunity for initial review of the contracted rate. In *Mobile* and *Sierra*, for example, the rates had been submitted to the agency previously under section 205 and allowed to remain in effect. *See Mobile*, 350 U.S. at 336, 76 S.Ct. 373; *Sierra*, 350 U.S. at 352, 76 S.Ct. 368. Such an initial review is an important precondition to *Mobile-Sierra* because, as FERC has explained, applying the doctrine in "first review cases would mean that '[the agency's] ability to protect the public interest would be negligible and public regulation would consist of little more than rubber-stamping private contracts.'" *Potomac Elec. Power Co. v. FERC (PEPCO)*, 210 F.3d 403, 409 (D.C.Cir.2000) (quoting *Ne. Utils. Serv. Co.*, 66 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,332, at ¶ 62,087, 1994 WL 92839 (1994), *aff'd*, 55 F.3d 686 (1st Cir.1995)); *see also PEPCO*, 210 F.3d at 406 (noting that challenged contracts had "been found to be just and reasonable when originally approved" by FERC).

Consistent with its previous rulings, FERC concedes here that an opportunity for initial review of whether a rate is just and reasonable is necessary for *Mobile-Sierra* to apply. The Intervenor-Respondents, however, cite to a thirty-year old D.C. Circuit decision, *see Borough of Lansdale v. Fed. Power Comm'n*, 494 F.2d 1104, 1112-14 (D.C.Cir.1974), and argue that an opportunity for initial review is not necessary to trigger the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption. We disagree.

The analysis in *Lansdale* is not applicable to this case. In *Lansdale*, a seller, joined by the Commission, sought to ignore a rate in a contract to which it had previously agreed but which it had not properly filed with the Commission, and instead file a higher rate, "as if the contract had never been negotiated." *Id.* at 1112; *see also id.* at 1107-08. The D.C.

Circuit refused to allow this unilateral revision of an agreement, holding that the Commission could not permit the higher rate of the second contract to go into effect unless and until it found that the original rates were unlawful. *See id.* at 1117.

Lansdale did not allow the seller to "convert its statutory duty to file into a vehicle for breaching the 1971 contract with Lansdale." *Id.* at 1112. In other words, *Lansdale* focused on whether *Mobile-Sierra* review allows the adoption of a *second* contract with a higher rate when the first was never correctly filed with the Commission. As such, *Lansdale* primarily reflected concern over a seller's abuse of the rate-filing requirement. *Lansdale* did *not* decide, because the question was not before it, that the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption always applies to the filing of an initial rate, regardless of the circumstances.

In this case, the answers to the questions presented turn in part upon whether *Mobile-Sierra* applies to the rate *first* set in a contract entered into under a seller's market-based rate authority, rather than only to a later challenge maintaining that earlier-established rates are *no longer* just and reasonable. The local utilities do not maintain that the original contract is void because it was never filed, but rather that the rates set were unjust and unreasonable when established and should be modified. *Lansdale's* position that a seller may not profit by failing properly to file a rate-setting contract it freely entered into is hardly remarkable, but is also not particularly pertinent to the questions at issue here.

Indeed, just a year before *Lansdale* was decided, the Supreme Court recognized the importance of an opportunity for an initial just and reasonableness review to the overall statutory scheme. In *Federal Power Commission v. Texaco, Inc. (Texaco I)*, 417 U.S. 380, 94 S.Ct. 2315, 41 L.Ed.2d 141 (1974), the Court struck down an indirect regulatory scheme adopted by the Commission that would have provided a "blanket certificate procedure for small producers of natural gas." *See id.* at 382, 395, 94 S.Ct. 2315.

One of the primary reasons for the decision was that "[t]here was no finding that these contemplated increased rates for flowing gas would be just and reasonable. The Commission merely asserts in its brief here that it was familiar with the existing contracts and must have considered the rates reserved to be acceptable under the Act." *Id.* at 396, 94 S.Ct. 2315.

In short, FERC is correct to recognize that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine apples only if a newly-entered contract remains in effect *after* there is an opportunity for plenary, "just and reasonable" agency review.

2. *Meaningful Review of the Circumstances of Contract Formation*

Not only must FERC have an opportunity for some initial review of rates, but the scope of that review must permit consideration of the factors relevant to the propriety of the contract's formation. *See Atl. City Elec. Co.*, 295 F.3d at 14 (holding that *Mobile-Sierra* applies "assuming that there was no reason to question what transpired at the contract formation stage") (citing *Town of Norwood v. FERC*, 587 F.2d 1306, 1312 (D.C.Cir.1978)). The original premise of *Mobile-Sierra* was that as long as the rate was just and reasonable when the contract was formed, there would be a presumption—based on both the need to protect stability of contract and the likelihood that market participants entering into long-term contracts can protect their own interests—that the reasonableness continued throughout the term of the contract. *See Verizon*, 535 U.S. at 479, 122 S.Ct. 1646 ("In wholesale markets, the party charging the rate and the party charged were often sophisticated businesses enjoying presumptively equal bargaining power, who could be expected to negotiate a 'just and reasonable' rate as between the two of them."). In the present regulatory regime, these relevant factors focus on whether the original negotiations occurred in a functional marketplace such that we may presume the contracted rates were originally just and reasonable.

V. APPLICATION OF MOBILE-SIERRA

A. Contractual Waiver of Section 206 Rights

Having established the prerequisites to *Mobile-Sierra* review under the current regulatory regime, we address first whether the contracts at issue permit *Mobile-Sierra* review. In this case, FERC determined that there was no express reservation of unilateral modification. As FERC noted, "[f]or all but one of the contracts identified by the complainants, Section 6.1 of the umbrella [Power Pool] Agreement appears to be the only specific contractual provision which may affect parties' rights to make changes to contracts entered into under the [Power Pool] agreement." *April 11 Order*, 99 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,190.[21]

The relevant portion of section 6.1 states:

> Nothing contained herein shall be construed as affecting in any way the right of the Parties to jointly make application to FERC for a change in the rates and charges, classification, service, terms, or conditions affecting [Power Pool] transactions under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act and pursuant to FERC rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Id. ¶ 61,190 n. 10. Applying the interpretive doctrine of *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*,[22] FERC viewed the reservation of *joint* section 205 rights as confirming the

---

[21] FERC found that Section 39B of the Snohomish-Morgan Stanley Confirmation Agreement expressly restricts the parties' rights to amend under both FPA sections 205 and 206. *April 11 Order*, 99 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,190 & n. 11. FERC noted, however, that even if Snohomish could overcome the restriction in Section 39B, it would still be restricted by Section 6.1 of the Power Pool agreement. *Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,389. Because we hold the Power Pool agreement, both standing alone and taking Section 6.1 into account, is consistent with *Mobile-Sierra* review, we have no need to consider Section 39B of the Snohomish-Morgan Stanley Confirmation Agreement.

[22] The Latin phrase means the "express[ion] or inclu[sion of] one thing implies the exclusion of the other." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 620 (8th ed.1999).

parties' intention otherwise to abide by the contractual terms for the time period covered. *Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,388.

"FERC is entitled to some deference in construing contracts where the sales are subject to FERC regulation." *Boston Edison*, 233 F.3d at 66 (citing *Memphis*, 358 U.S. at 114, 79 S.Ct. 194); *see also City of Seattle v. FERC*, 923 F.2d 713, 716 (9th Cir.1991) (granting FERC deference in the interpretation of contracts). With or without that deference, we agree with FERC that these contracts do not preclude *Mobile-Sierra* review, but we do not rely on the *expressio unius* precept in so concluding. Instead, like the D.C. Circuit in *Texaco II*, 148 F.3d at 1096, we hold that private long-term contracts can be *generally* governed by *Mobile-Sierra* if such review is otherwise appropriate, unless there is a specific indication in the contract that section 205 or 206 rights have been reserved.

Texaco II considered a boilerplate clause that said that the contract "shall comply with all applicable laws, statutes, ordinances, safety codes and rules and regulations of governmental authorities having jurisdiction." *Id.* The D.C. Circuit held that such a general clause does not reserve compliance with section 206 standards. In so deciding, the D.C. Circuit stated, in essence, a default rule, explaining: "The law is quite clear: absent contractual language 'susceptible to the construction that the rate may be altered while the contract[ ] subsist[s],' the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies." *Id.* (alterations in original) (quoting *Appalachian Power Co. v. Fed. Power Comm'n*, 529 F.2d 342, 348 (D.C.Cir.1976)). After *Texaco II*, the prevailing rule of contract interpretation with regard to the preservation of limited *Mobile-Sierra* review, according to the First Circuit, is that general statements that the law will "*otherwise* be binding" do not "negate the ordinary, default rule that *Mobile-Sierra* govern[s] FERC-proposed changes." *Boston Edison*, 233 F.3d at 67 (citing *Texaco II*, 148 F.3d at 1096).

The trio of authorities cited by the local utilities, all from the D.C. Circuit and all pre-*Texaco II*, are not inconsistent

with this interpretive principle. *See Union Pac. Fuels, Inc. v. FERC*, 129 F.3d 157 (D.C.Cir.1997); *Papago Tribal Util. Auth. v. FERC*, 723 F.2d 950 (D.C.Cir.1983); *Kansas Cities v. FERC*, 723 F.2d 82 (D.C.Cir.1983). In two of these cases, the court inferred an intent to permit full FERC review from a provision restricting review in narrow circumstances. *See Papago*, 723 F.2d at 954; *Kansas Cities*, 723 F.2d at 86-90. To infer from a narrow restriction on *unilateral* changes an intent otherwise to allow such changes, as *Kansas Cities* and *Papago* permitted, is quite different from inferring from a narrow authorization of *joint* authority to make changes an intent to allow *unilateral* changes, as the local utilities here insist FERC was required to do.

By contrast with *Papago*, *Kansas Cities*, and this case, the disputed contracts in *Union Pacific Fuels* did include a *Memphis* clause. *See Union Pac. Fuels*, 129 F.3d at 161. The contracts, however, also included a clause restricting the ability of the parties to seek a change to the "modified fixed variable rate design." *Id.* (internal quotation mark omitted). In these unusual circumstances, the D.C. Circuit upheld FERC's order requiring a provider to file proposed changes to its rate structure under section 5 of the Natural Gas Act despite that narrow restriction and noted:

> Nothing in the contracts expressly exempted the private agreement from rate changes initiated by FERC under NGA § 5 .... While Petitioners protest that boilerplate language acknowledging rate changes by FERC should not render [the] *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine inapplicable, ... they do not explain why they could not have adopted language that would simply and clearly have invoked *Mobile-Sierra*.

Id. at 161-62. *Texaco II*, issued by the same court a year later, explained that this language in *Union Pacific Fuels* does not have application beyond the situation there presented, in which the contract contains a clause that does, generally, negate the default *Mobile-Sierra* rule. *See Texaco II*, 148 F.3d at 1096 (noting that in *Union Pacific Fuels*, the court "*inadvertently* lent support to the

inference" that absent express language *invoking Mobile-Sierra*, FERC ordinarily is free to review rates without regard to the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption (emphasis added)).

We agree with the D.C. and First Circuits that the *Mobile-Sierra* presumptions are, in essence, self-executing. Adoption of a *Memphis* clause permitting a party to an energy contract to modify its terms unilaterally demonstrates that the parties were not seeking to establish the stability of energy contracts the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine seeks to foster. Absent such a clause, the *Mobile-Sierra* balance between preserving the stability of private contracts and protecting the public interest in just and reasonable rates prevails. Preserving *joint* modification does not negate the default application of the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption when that presumption is otherwise appropriate, as the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption applies to unilateral, not joint, rate changes. Indeed, parties to energy contracts, like parties to any other contract, are free, by agreement, to vary the terms of the contract mid-term, with or without a prior pact allowing them to do so. When parties to an energy contract do so vary an agreement, sections 205 and 206 apply according to their express terms.

We therefore uphold FERC's interpretation of section 6.1 of the Power Pool agreement as reasonable.

B. Timely and Effective Review of Rates

As the parties intended *Mobile-Sierra* review to apply, we next consider whether, as FERC maintains, its blanket grant of market-based rate authority qualifies as sufficient prior review and approval of all contracts made under that authorization to trigger the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption in any later section 206 challenge. If not, then the contracts here were not subject to "first review" by FERC under the FPA and do not trigger the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine. We hold that although market-based rate authority *can* qualify as sufficient prior review to justify limited *Mobile-Sierra* review, it can only do so when accompanied by effective

oversight permitting timely reconsideration of market-based authorization if market conditions change.

Two fairly recent decisions of this circuit considered the role of market-based rate authority under the FPA. In *Grays Harbor*, we held that a contract entered into during the California energy crisis pursuant to the market-based rate regime was protected under the "filed rate doctrine."[23] *See* 379 F.3d at 651-52. We relied heavily on FERC's contention that the regime offered continued and ongoing oversight and thereby "assured that the market-based rates charged comply with the FPA's requirement that rates be just and reasonable." *Id.* at 651. On that basis, *Grays Harbor* concluded that, "while market-based rates may not have historically been the type of rate envisioned by the filed rate doctrine, ... they do not fall outside the purview of the doctrine." *Id.*

More recently, we again stressed the need for oversight in a market-based rate regime in holding "that market-based tariffs do not, *per se* violate the FPA." *Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1014. *Lockyer* held the initial grant of market-based rate authority alone was not enough to assure just and reasonable rates, as FERC recognized when it "affirmed in its presentation before us that it is *not* contending that approval of a market-based tariff *based on market forces alone* would comply with the FPA or the filed rate doctrine." *Id.* at 1013 (emphasis added). The court clarified further that "a market-based tariff cannot be structured so as to virtually deregulate an industry and remove it from statutorily required oversight." *Id.* at 1014.

Lockyer's emphasis on the need for continued oversight of contract rates is critically important to our current inquiry. In *Lockyer*, California sought relief under section

---

[23] The filed rate doctrine provides that state law and some federal law (e.g.antitrust) may not be used to strike down a rate subject to FERC's exclusive jurisdiction. *See Grays Harbor*, 379 F.3d at 650; *see also Davel Commc'ns, Inc. v. Qwest Corp.*, 460 F.3d 1075, 1084-86 (9th Cir. 2006) (discussing the filed rate doctrine).

205 from rates established by wholesale energy companies (many of whom are Intervenor-Respondents here) while there were dysfunctions in the spot market during the California energy crisis. The Court made the following observation regarding FERC "oversight" at the time:

> Despite the promise of truly competitive market-based rates, the California energy market was subjected to artificial manipulation on a massive scale. *With FERC abdicating its regulatory responsibility*, California consumers were subjected to a variety of market machinations, such as "round trip trades" and "hockey-stick bidding," coupled with manipulative corporate strategies, such as those nicknamed "Fat-Boy," "Get Shorty," and "Death Star."

Id. at 1014-15 (emphasis added) (footnotes omitted). Under these circumstances, the court concluded, "[t]o cabin FERC's section 205 refund authority ... would be manifestly contrary to the fundamental purpose and structure of the FPA.... The FPA cannot be construed to immunize those who overcharge and manipulate markets in violation of the FPA." *Id.* at 1017.

The requirement of continued oversight in a market-based rate regime applies equally to the section 206 context, and to the application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine in section 206 review. *Lockyer* flatly stated that the FPA does not allow a market-based regime absent "implied enforcement mechanisms sufficient to provide substitute remedies for the obtaining of refunds for the imposition of unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory rates." *Id.* at 1016. Furthermore, *Lockyer* indicates that even in a properly approved market-based rate regime, section 206 remedies are still fully available. *See id.* at 1017 (noting that the "only remedies [under section 206] are prospective").

Taken together, these recent circuit decisions support the following conclusion: Market-based rate authority provides a meaningful opportunity for prior review and approval of rates under the FPA, an essential prerequisite to the *Mobile-Sierra* mode of rate review, *only* insofar as

FERC implements and uses an effective oversight mechanism *after* the market-based rate authorization is initially granted. Only then can FERC meet its statutory duty to ensure that *all* rates are "just and reasonable."

This conclusion is bolstered by the judicial treatment of two similar regimes instituted by FERC in the past. In *Texaco I*, the Supreme Court considered the Federal Power Commission's attempt to utilize a "blanket certificate procedure for small producers of natural gas" that would "relieve[ ] them of almost all filing requirements." 417 U.S. at 382, 94 S.Ct. 2315. The Federal Power Commission's rationale was that small producers would be subject to the forces of the market and could therefore only charge what the market would bear. *See id.* at 390, 94 S.Ct. 2315. The Federal Power Commission's rationale in *Texaco I* thus was essentially the same as FERC's rationale here: That case's "small producers," like the market-based rate authority producers here, were asserted to lack market power and were therefore authorized to set rates with no further oversight. The assumption was that the rates set would necessarily be competitive and would therefore tend to reflect the cost of production, including the cost of attracting investment.

The Court affirmed that such a system of "indirect regulation" was permissible under the Natural Gas Act, *see id.*, but struck down the order because it did not sufficiently assure *oversight* to meet the statutory requirement of "just and reasonable" review. *See id.* at 395-96, 94 S.Ct. 2315. The Court so held despite the FPC's assurances that it would review the prices of contracts made pursuant to this authority, *see id.* at 396-97, 94 S.Ct. 2315, stating:

> [W]e should also stress that in our view the prevailing price in the marketplace *cannot be the final measure of "just and reasonable" rates mandated by the Act.* It is abundantly clear from the history of the Act and from the events that prompted its adoption that Congress considered that the natural gas industry was heavily

> concentrated and that monopolistic forces were distorting the market price for natural gas.... In subjecting producers to regulation because of anticompetitive conditions in the industry, Congress could *not* have assumed that "just and reasonable" rates could conclusively be determined by reference to market price.

Id. at 397-99, 94 S.Ct. 2315 (emphasis added) (footnotes omitted).

The D.C. Circuit followed *Texaco I's* approach when considering a FERC regulation for the oil industry based on the premise that "competitive market forces should be relied upon in the main to assure proper rate levels." *See Farmers Union*, 734 F.2d at 1490. That court was adamant in holding "FERC's largely undocumented reliance on market forces as the principal means of rate regulation to be ... misplaced. It is of course elementary that market failure and the control of monopoly power are central rationales for the imposition of rate regulation." *Id.* at 1508 (citing STEPHEN BREYER, REGULATION AND ITS REFORM 15-16 (1982)) (footnote omitted). Indeed, the "fundamental flaw in the Commission's scheme" was that "nothing in the regulatory scheme itself acts as a monitor to see if [competition drives rates into the 'zone of reasonableness'] or to check rates if it does not." *Id.* at 1509.

Here, FERC failed to adopt any monitoring mechanism before applying deferential *Mobile-Sierra* review to the challenged contracts. When FERC encouraged the local utilities to purchase power in the forward market, the agency promised to oversee the forward market contracts to ensure their justness and reasonableness. *See December 15 Order*, 93 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,994. FERC later held, however, that its approval of energy sellers' market-based rate authority—long *prior* to the market failures that gave rise to the December 15 Order—allowed it to apply the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine without any direct inquiry into whether the resulting rates were in fact "just and reasonable," and also

without any inquiry into the actual state of the market at the time contracts were negotiated. *See Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,388-89.

In light of the foregoing discussion, we must answer the crucial question: Did FERC provide sufficient oversight for contracts made under market-based rate authority to ensure that the resulting rates were within the statutory "just and reasonable" range in the first instance, thereby permitting reliance on the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine as to the continuing effectiveness of those contracts? We hold that it did not.

FERC asserted in its Order on Initial Decision that the grant of market-based rate authority *is* sufficient predetermination, so that it was "not required specifically to review each agreement" made pursuant to the grant of market-based rate authority. *Id.* ¶ 62,389. In other words, FERC contends that because it requires, before granting market-based rate authority, a showing of lack of market power and regular reporting, it has therefore fulfilled its oversight role, and no further oversight is necessary. FERC asserted the same position on rehearing, maintaining that its decision in *Lockyer* supports that result. *Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,982-83.

In FERC's *Lockyer* decision, the agency held that once market-based rate authority is granted, additional oversight is a "compliance issue." *California ex rel. Lockyer*, 99 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,247 at ¶ 62,063, 2002 WL 32035504 (2002); *see also Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1015. We rejected this aspect of FERC's *Lockyer* decision, however, because without active oversight, "effective federal regulation is removed altogether." *Lockyer*, 383 F.3d at 1015. We reject FERC's reliance on that same proposition as a pillar of FERC's invocation of the *Mobile-Sierra* mode of review in this case.

FERC's position here, as in *Lockyer*, is that it fulfills its monitoring obligation by imposing on sellers with market-based rate authority the requirement that they file Quarterly Transaction Reports, make the Reports available for public review, and submit data on a triennial basis to

confirm the continued lack (or mitigation) of market power. This data collection activity, however, was insufficient to fulfill FERC's statutory obligation with respect to the contracts challenged here. As demonstrated by what actually happened during the California energy crisis, this sporadic data collection approach is pragmatically unlikely to expose in a timely manner the impact of market changes—in this instance, the impact on the forward market of acknowledged severe market changes within the dysfunctional spot market. That such impacts can occur without affecting FERC's continuing approval of market-based rate authority undercuts FERC's assertion that initial just and reasonableness review occurred with regard to the challenged contracts sufficient to trigger the *Mobile-Sierra* mode of review.

In particular, the quarterly reporting requirement, standing alone, permits review of the grounds for market-based rate authority only with regard to contracts entered into *after* the impact of the market dysfunction or market power on long-term bilateral contracts has already occurred, affecting the likelihood that the contracts in fact set rates within the statutory "just and reasonable" range. There is a crucial difference between this review—that is, purely prospective review, affecting only future contracts—and one that permits consideration of the market conditions at the time a challenged forward contract was entered. *See El Paso Elec. Co.*, 108 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,071, at ¶ 61,370 n. 10 (2004) ("A revocation of market-based rates ... would not void contracts that parties may have signed...."). The latter kind of remedy is the kind the local utilities ask for here: They seek *modification* of the contracts here at issue, prospectively from the refund effective date but based on the market circumstances that prevailed at the times the contracts were negotiated.

A hypothetical explains the dilemma with FERC's present "oversight scheme": Seller A receives market-based rate authority in Year 1. In Year 5, prices increase dramatically in short-term markets Buyer B, needing to

escape these markets, agrees to long-term contracts X, Y, and Z to buy wholesale energy from Seller A. Buyer B agrees to the contract terms because in a frantic market Seller A is one of the only suppliers willing to enter into a long-term contract, and Buyer B needs to ensure that its supply is able to meet the load required by its retail customers. In its next required quarterly report in Year 6, Seller A dutifully transfers the proper information about its rates to FERC. FERC—perhaps reviewing contracts X, Y, and Z—discovers that the assumption of a functioning market underlying its approval of market-based rate authority for Seller A does not accord with the rates being charged in forward contracts generally, or in those entered by Seller A in particular. FERC therefore revokes Seller A's market-based rate authority. FERC's action, however, will do nothing to reform those troubling contracts.

The problem raised by this hypothetical is that FERC has *no* opportunity to review whether contracts X, Y, and Z are just and reasonable before they are entered. As FERC recognizes, revocation of market-based rate authority in Year 6 in the above hypothetical can only provide relief for contracts made thereafter. *See id.* If a contract is entered into in Year 5, FERC cannot consider whether the basis for market-based rate authority had so atrophied by this time that the economic basis for assuming the rates established would be within the statutorily mandated "just and reasonable" range had evaporated. Instead, FERC applies the most-forgiving version of review, the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption that long-term bilateral contracts will reflect just and reasonable rates, without *any* opportunity for initial review of such contractual rates, whether cost or market based.

This case is precisely parallel to the above hypothetical. For example, Enron, an Intervenor-Respondent in this case, *did* have its market-based rate authority revoked, because of the actions it took during the time period in which the contracts at issue here were entered into. *Enron Power Mktg., Inc.*, 103 F.E.R.C. ¶ 61,343, at ¶ 62,202 (2003). By

revoking that power, FERC restricted Enron's *prospective* power to enter into contracts. *Id.* ¶¶ 62,307-10. The very day after revoking Enron's market-based rate authority, however, FERC denied Nevada Power's request to reform its contracts with Enron even though they were made during the very period FERC identified Enron as grossly abusing and violating its market-based rate authority. *See Order on Initial Decision*, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,397. FERC accomplished this result by applying a *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" standard to the contract reformation proceedings. *See id.* By doing so, FERC neither performed the full scope of "just and reasonable" review nor revisited the market circumstances in which the agreements were entered to determine whether those circumstances were sufficiently functional that they were likely to yield long-term contracts within the "just and reasonable" range.

This approach to section 206 review simply cannot be squared with the statutory scheme. Section 206 commands prospective revision of rates that, as of the refund effective date, are not just and reasonable: When FERC determines that a rate is unjust or unreasonable, "the Commission shall determine the just and reasonable rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and shall fix the same by order." 16 U.S.C. § 824e(a). By layering *Mobile-Sierra* review on top of a market-based rate authority that can be revoked only prospectively from the refund effective date, FERC abdicates its statutory responsibility to provide such rate revision when appropriate.

FERC represents in its post-argument submission that the local utilities could have challenged the sellers market-based rate authority at the time they entered into the challenged contracts. That representation is true, but beside the point. Any such challenge, even if successful, could not have been a basis for reforming the challenged contracts, even if the excessively high rates established by the contracts were strong indications that market-based rate authority *should* be revoked. Rescission of market-

based rate authority still would have affected only later contracts, leaving the challenged agreements subject to limited *Mobile-Sierra* public interest review.

As a result of FERC's refusal to consider the abrogation of market-based rate authority except with respect to future contracts, and given the dramatic and sudden nature of the onset of the California energy crisis and the limited period of time that the local utilities had to respond to it, the local utilities here had no meaningful opportunity to institute a challenge to these sellers' market-based rate authority before entering the disputed agreements. For example, in February 2001, California enacted legislation allowing its Department of Water Resources to purchase power on behalf of its deteriorating investor-owned utilities. Southern Cal Water's previous supplier, Dynegy promptly told Southern Cal Water that it was "not interested in extending or renegotiating" its previous one year contract with Southern Cal Water that expired in April 2001, as Dynegy "could sell its generation output to the State of California."

Southern Cal Water was thus left with less than two months to obtain power for the following year and only three "choices": (1) immediately negotiate a long-term contract that could take effect in April 2001; (2) shift to the spot markets, by then recognized by FERC as manipulated and dysfunctional markets that had already caused hyper-pricing and bankrupted several utility companies; or (3) shut down operation and fail to provide electricity for its retail customers. Faced with these choices, Southern Cal Water entered into a forward contract based on a bidding period of little more than two weeks. Under these time constraints, Southern Cal Water could not have challenged the seller's market-based rate authority, obtained an order from FERC, and then negotiated a forward agreement and signed a contract with the very seller whose market-based rate authority it had just challenged. There was simply no realistic way that Southern Cal Water could continue to

participate in the forward market while assuring meaningful "just and reasonable" review.

Ultimately, the fatal flaw in FERC's approach to "oversight" is that it precludes timely consideration of sudden market changes and offers no protection to purchasers victimized by the abuses of sellers or dysfunctional market conditions that FERC itself only notices in hindsight. For example, on December 15, 2000, FERC issued an order encouraging the adoption of long-term contracts and establishing a benchmark price of $74/Mwh. *See December 15 Order*, 93 F.E.R.C. at ¶¶ 61,994-95. FERC promised that it would "be vigilant in monitoring the possible exercise of market power ... [t]o address concerns about potentially unjust and unreasonable rates in the long-term markets." *Id.* ¶ 61,994. In fact, because of its flawed processes, FERC was never able to "address concerns about potentially unjust and unreasonable rates in the long-term markets," because it had no means to revoke market-based rate authority before the precipitously entered contracts went into effect and became, in FERC's view, no longer subject to cost-based "just and reasonable" review. As a result, FERC failed to detect that, according to its own benchmarks, something was awry in the forward markets that produced these contracts.

As in *Lockyer*, we do not dispute that FERC may adopt a regulatory regime that differs from the historical cost-based regime of the energy market, or that market-based rate authority may be a tenable choice if sufficient safeguards are taken to provide for sufficient oversight. FERC, however, cannot use that choice to excuse its duty to maintain effective oversight and then invoke *Mobile-Sierra* as a ground for precluding ordinary rate review, including review of the propriety of market-based rate authority at the time the contracts became effective. Any other conclusion would permit FERC to abdicate entirely its statutory responsibility under the FPA to ensure that *all*

rates, including bilateral contract rates, are "just and reasonable."

C. Meaningful Review of Contract Formation

This fundamental procedural error was compounded by FERC's substantive adherence to *Mobile-Sierra* without regard to the market conditions in which the contracts at issue were formed. As we have explained, *Mobile-Sierra* cannot apply without a determination that the challenged contract was initially formed free from the influence of improper factors, such as market manipulation, the leverage of market power, or an otherwise dysfunctional market.

The local utilities argue here that the frenzied market conditions of the California energy crisis in the spot market influenced the forward market in such a manner as to raise a question about what transpired during formation of the forward contracts here at issue. The most important evidence supporting this position is the FERC Staff Report concerning price manipulation in the western United States at the time these contracts were formed. The FERC staff concluded:

> Our analysis shows ... that forward power prices negotiated during 2000-2001 in the western United States were *significantly influenced* by the then-current spot power prices. This tells us that the *trauma* of the dysfunctional spot power prices at that time *so influenced buyers that they placed great weight on these prices in forming future expectations.*

Staff Report at ES-9 (emphasis added). The report noted that the influence was greatest for one-to-two year forward contracts,[24] and that there is a "statistically significant relationship" between the spot price and forward price. *Id.*

Although it noted the Staff's findings, FERC held them irrelevant because they did not demonstrate that the rates in the forward contracts affected the "public interest."

---

[24] Most of the contracts challenged by Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific are within that time range.

Order on Initial Decision, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,397. FERC therefore did not consider the staff findings in determining *whether* the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine was applicable to these contracts; instead, FERC discarded the findings after determining, for independent reasons, that the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine *was* applicable. The upshot is that FERC failed ever to consider whether the influence of the spot markets on the forward markets reached a level sufficient to question whether FERC could assume that two private parties had negotiated a "just and reasonable" contract in the first instance and therefore apply the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption.

FERC's very limited factual findings regarding the state of the market at the time the challenged contracts were negotiated are thus not responsive to the theory advanced by the local utilities here. FERC held only that because the local utilities entered into the challenged contracts "voluntarily" and because "there is no evidence of unfairness, bad faith, or duress in the original negotiations [of the forward contracts], the [local utilities] are not entitled to change their bargains." *Id.* at ¶¶ 62,399-62,400. But the local utilities do not allege that the energy companies manipulated their negotiations of the contracts here at issue; the local utilities challenge the *context*, not the conduct, of those negotiations. Consistently with the Staff Report's findings, the local utilities are maintaining that factors exogenous to the forward market, the dysfunction and manipulation of the spot market, artificially influenced the rates in the forward market, creating market dysfunction in the forward market.[25] The local utilities'

---

25 FERC's premise, never examined in its orders and opinions, is that the spot and forward markets can and should be analyzed separately. Many of the participants in the two markets are the same, however, as is the product sold–electric power. The only difference is the time frame for delivery of that product. For present purposes, we accept FERC's assumption that the two markets are sufficiently separate that there is at least a question as to the scope of the impact of the dysfunctional spot market on the forward market.

argument is that when such market dysfunction occurs *and* there is no opportunity to revisit the propriety of the market-based rate authority in effect when the contract was entered, FERC cannot assume that contractual terms were just and reasonable as between the contracting parties when the agreement was negotiated. As a result, FERC cannot focus only on "public interest" considerations when the rates established are thereafter challenged.

In this case, the questions raised by the Staff Report—whether and how the manipulated spot market influenced the forward markets—*are* relevant to determining whether the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine applies, because they raise questions about the market conditions at the time of contract formation and thus about the propriety of relying on a regime of market-based rate authority at that time to produce just and reasonable rates. Although FERC "is not obligated to justify deviations from an approach suggested by its own staff," when "the conceptual underpinnings of the staff's approach" are "critical to a reasoned resolution of the problem," then FERC must address them. *Pub. Utils. Comm'n v. FERC*, 817 F.2d 858, 862-63 (D.C.Cir.1987).

We conclude that FERC's decision to treat the market-function evidence as irrelevant to the question *whether Mobile-Sierra* applies, and its resulting application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, was fundamental error. In a regulatory regime predicated on the grant of market-based rate authority, the decision whether to apply *Mobile-Sierra* to subsequent contracts formed under that authority requires FERC and reviewing courts to determine if the contracts at issue were initially entered into in fully functioning markets. FERC's application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine without considering the contract formation issues was error.

D. Effect on the "Public Interest"

FERC's error in its approach to deciding *whether* to apply the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption was compounded by its use of an erroneous standard for determining whether

the challenged contracts affect the public interest. As our historical summary shows, electric utility deregulation has made it increasingly necessary for FERC to consider wholesale power contracts' effect on the consuming public. In its efforts to determine the impact on the public interest under *Mobile-Sierra*, however, FERC relied on the wrong legal standard, applying factors taken from the context of a *low-rate* challenge rather than those relevant to the *high-rate* challenge present in this case.

As we discussed in Part II, state agencies in the past regulated heavily the rates charged directly to the public. Electric rate regulation reform, however, has significantly limited the role state regulators play and simultaneously increased the importance of federal regulation for the prices paid by retail ratepayers. FERC's increased responsibility for protecting the public's interest makes its obligation to ensure that wholesale rates do not unjustifiably adversely affect the public—always a part of FERC's statutory mandate—more important than it was when the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine first developed. Because, at present, FERC, not state regulators, "is perhaps in the best position to reach the most equitable result and to act in the public interest," *Miss. Indus. v. FERC*, 808 F.2d 1525, 1549 (D.C.Cir.1987) (per curiam) (quoting *Middle S. Serv., Inc.*, 30 F.E.R.C. ¶ 63,030, at ¶ 65,151 (1985)), FERC must give predominant weight in determining whether to modify a contract under section 206 to the impact of a challenged wholesale contract on the rates paid by the consuming public who use the energy covered by the contract. Tested against this protocol, the agency's narrow conception of "public interest" review does not suffice.

FERC determined that the challenged contract rates did not impact the public interest principally because the local utilities presented little evidence relevant to the three public interest factors specifically mentioned in *Sierra*.[26]

---

26 In such circumstances [when the public interest test satisfies]

Order on Initial Decision, 103 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 62,397. Similarly, FERC's briefs in this court, assume, erroneously, that *Sierra* established a three-prong public interest standard applicable across all circumstances, an assumption with which we do not agree. In particular, the "excessive burden" reference in *Sierra*, heavily relied upon by FERC in this case in concluding that there was no impact on the public interest, has no application here.

As the text from *Sierra*, reproduced in the margins, demonstrates, the three *Sierra* factors were specifically identified as relevant to the *low-rate* challenge presented in that case. Rates asserted to be *lower* than those FERC would approve *ab initio* will not ordinarily directly affect the most obvious "public interest" underlying the FPA—namely, avoidance of unnecessarily high rates for the consuming public. That *Sierra* does not mention such a consideration is thus no wonder. *See Ne. Utils. Serv. Co. v. FERC* (*Ne.Utils.II*), 55 F.3d 686, 691 (1st Cir. 1995) (applying a broader definition of "public interest" in a high-rate challenge because "[i]t all depends on whose ox is gored and how the public interest is affected"); *cf. Permian Basin Area Rate Cases*, 390 U.S. 747, 783-84, 88 S.Ct. 1344, 20 L.Ed.2d 312 (1968) (approving Federal Power Commission's setting of maximum rates because of the impact on the public interest). Indeed, the D.C. Circuit has characterized *Sierra* as establishing the rule that "a heavy burden must be met before a *customer* who has negotiated a fixed-price contract can be deprived against his will of the *benefit of his bargain*." *Town of Norwood*, 587 F.2d at 1310 (emphases added). When a customer has negotiated a low contract rate, FERC must meet a high burden before raising that

---

> [FERC's duty to ensure just and reasonable rates] the sole concern of the Commission would seem to be *whether the rate is so low* as to adversely affect the public interest–as where it might impair the financial ability of the public utility to continue its service, cast upon other consumers an excessive burden, or be unduly discriminatory.

Sierra, 350 U.S. at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368 (emphasis added).

rate. By contrast, in this case, the customer is complaining of a *high* rate. The concerns in such a high-rate case are not entirely parallel to those in a low-rate case.

The primary "public interest" at issue in a low-rate challenge, such as *Sierra*, is in keeping utilities in operation so the public is not deprived of services. *Sierra* also mentioned avoidance of rates "so low as to ... cast upon *other* consumers an excessive burden." 350 U.S. at 355, 76 S.Ct. 368 (emphasis added). The reason for concern with "excessive burden" on "*other* consumers" is that charging rates in some wholesale contracts that are too low to recoup production costs and a fair profit could lead utilities burdened with such low rate agreements to recoup their costs and profit margins by charging higher rates than are just and reasonable to other wholesale customers. Such a burden is "excessive" because it requires third parties to pay for costs, including the cost of capital, that properly should have been borne by the consumers who purchase energy covered by the challenged contract. Contrary to FERC's supposition in this case, the reference to an "excessive" burden in *Sierra* did not signal that it is fine to burden customers with unjustifiably higher rates as long as those rates are not so high as to be "excessive" in some absolute sense.

In contrast, the key "public interest" in a high-rate challenge, such as this one, is assuring that the consuming public pays fair rates for the very energy covered by the challenged contracts. *Sierra's* limitation of relief to cases where "other" customers endure an "excessive burden" has no application to this direct pass-through concern. Instead, if a challenged contract imposes any significant cost on ultimate customers because of a wholesale rate too high to be within a zone of reasonableness, *see INGAA*, 285 F.3d at 31, that contract affects the public interest.

To be sure, the stability of contract considerations that underlie the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine do carry over to challenges by buyers rather than sellers. *See Mobile*, 350 U.S. at 344, 76 S.Ct. 373 (holding that no party may

"unilaterally" change contract because "preserving the integrity of contracts ... permits the stability of supply arrangements"). Those considerations, however, do not justify abnegation of FERC's statutory responsibility to protect the public from unjustifiably high rates in wholesale contracts.

The public interest standard, consequently, must be adjusted to give appropriate weight to that concern. In particular, in determining whether a challenged rate affects the public interest, FERC must take into account the Supreme Court's admonition that even "a small dent in the consumer's pocket" is relevant to the determination of fair rates. *Texaco I*, 417 U.S. at 399, 94 S.Ct. 2315. In the context of a high-rate challenge, consequently, a high-rate public interest determination should focus on whether consumers' electricity bills have been affected by the challenged rates—not necessarily whether the electricity bills have increased since the signing of the contracts, but whether those bills are higher than they would otherwise have been had the challenged contracts called for rates within the just and reasonable range.

This is not to say that *any* direct impact on consumer rates is enough to demonstrate a public interest effect sufficient to displace the countervailing *Mobile-Sierra* concern with protecting the stability of contract. Market-based rate regulation presumes—appropriately—that a functioning marketplace will drive prices towards marginal cost, and therefore toward such a reasonable range, "at least over the long pull." *INGAA*, 285 F.3d at 31. Even if a particular rate exceeds marginal cost, however, it may still be within this reasonable range—or "zone of reasonableness"—if that higher-than-cost-based price results from normal market forces and is part of a general trend toward rates that do reflect cost. *See id.* at 32 (noting that brief spikes in pipeline rates "are completely consistent with competition"). Thus, the proper standard for the *Mobile-Sierra* "public interest" mode of review in a high-rate challenge is not whether the contracted rates pose an

"excessive burden" on consumers, but whether the wholesale energy contract is outside the "zone of reasonableness" and results in retail rates higher than would be the case if that zone were not exceeded. This standard mirrors that endorsed by the D.C. Circuit for determination of a just and reasonable rate under a market-based rate regulation regime, *see INGAA*, 285 F.3d at 31-36, and provides an appropriate context for the Supreme Court's "small dent" admonition in such a regulatory environment.

After reviewing the record carefully, we are certain that FERC did not properly assess the public interest of any of the contracts before it in this case.

1. *Snohomish*

Snohomish had already increased its retail rates by 35 percent to accommodate the payment of increased prices for power, averaging $125/MWh. Because Snohomish could not obtain forward contracts that allowed it to bring the retail rates back within a normal range, it appears that the contracts at issue did, in fact, impact Snohomish's customers. Contrary to FERC's assertion, it does not matter whether a rate increase occurred before or after a petitioner signed one of the challenged contracts. *See Order on Rehearing*, 105 F.E.R.C. at ¶ 61,986. In either case, the contract could cause customers to pay higher rates than they would have without the contract. Further, FERC specifically found that the challenged Morgan Stanley contract accounted for an eight percent increase for retail ratepayers over 2001 rates. *Id.*

2. *Southern Cal Water*

FERC acknowledged that the challenged contracts led to electric bills of $35.13 per month for some Southern Cal Water customers. FERC held, however, that Southern Cal Water had not proven that such a bill "amounts to an *excessive* burden on the ratepayers." *Id.* (emphasis added). FERC's rejection of Southern Cal Water's claim because this increase did not amount to an "excessive burden," *id.*, is

in error because, as stated above, the "excessive burden" standard, which referred in *Sierra* to the impact on third parties of a wholesale contract so low as to necessitate that costs be recouped from other buyers, does not apply in this case, and did not in any event sanction impacts on consumers as long as not in some absolute sense "excessive."

3. *Nevada Power*

Nevada Power's retail rates decreased after the challenged contracts were negotiated. *Id.* This circumstance, however, cannot alone determine whether those contracts negatively affected the public interest. The decrease from peak rates charged during the crisis does not show that the slightly lower rates that resulted from the forward contracts did not affect the public interest. It is entirely possible that rates had increased so high during the energy crises because of dsyfunction in the spot market that, even with the acknowledged decrease in rates, consumers still paid more under the forward contracts than they otherwise would have. FERC should have performed a more sophisticated economic analysis to determine if the challenged contract affected the public interest.

* * *

y18For the foregoing reasons, we determine that a remand is necessary so that FERC can apply the proper statutory standards to determine, first, whether *Mobile-Sierra* review of the challenged contracts is appropriate; second, if so, to apply the modified form of *Mobile-Sierra* review outlined in this opinion; and finally, if not, to apply full just and reasonable review to the challenged contracts. The petition for review is hereby granted. We remand this case to FERC for proceedings consistent with this opinion.[27]

---

[27] Petitioner Snohomish also claims (1) that two FERC commissioners engaged in ex parte communications with wholesale energy sellers in violation of Snohomish's due process rights; (2) that these same communications violated the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552b; and (3) that certain evidentiary rulings of the Administrative Law Judge

PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED AND REMANDED.

---

violated Snohomish's due process rights. Because our remand order requires FERC to consider the complaints again in the first instance, we do not reach these additional issues.

16 U.S.C. § 824

§ 824. Declaration of policy; application of subchapter

(a) Federal regulation of transmission and sale of electric energy

It is declared that the business of transmitting and selling electric energy for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation of matters relating to generation to the extent provided in this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter and of that part of such business which consists of the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and the sale of such energy at wholesale in interstate commerce is necessary in the public interest, such Federal regulation, however, to extend only to those matters which are not subject to regulation by the States.

(b) Use or sale of electric energy in interstate commerce

(1) The provisions of this subchapter shall apply to the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and to the sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce, but except as provided in paragraph (2) shall not apply to any other sale of electric energy or deprive a State or State commission of its lawful authority now exercised over the exportation of hydroelectric energy which is transmitted across a State line. The Commission shall have jurisdiction over all facilities for such transmission or sale of electric energy, but shall not have jurisdiction, except as specifically provided in this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter, over facilities used for the generation of electric energy or over facilities used in local distribution or only for the transmission of electric energy in intrastate commerce, or over facilities for the transmission of electric energy consumed wholly by the transmitter.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (f) of this section, the provisions of sections 824b(a)(2), 824e(e), 824i, 824j, 824j-1, 824k, 824o, 824p, 824q, 824r, 824s, 824t, 824u, and 824v shall apply to the entities described in such provisions, and such entities shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission for purposes of carrying out such provisions and for purposes of applying the enforcement authorities of this chapter with respect to such provisions. Compliance with any order or rule of the Commission under the provisions of section 824b(a)(2), 824e(e), 824i, 824j, 824j-1, 824k, 824o, 824p, 824q, 824r, 824s, 824t, 824u, and 824v, shall not make an electric utility or other entity subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission for any purposes other than the purposes specified in the preceding sentence.

(c) Electric energy in interstate commerce

For the purpose of this subchapter, electric energy shall be held to be transmitted in interstate commerce if transmitted from a State and consumed at any point outside thereof; but only insofar as such transmission takes place within the United States.

(d) "Sale of electric energy at wholesale" defined

The term "sale of electric energy at wholesale" when used in this subchapter, means a sale of electric energy to any person for resale.

(e) "Public utility" defined

The term "public utility" when used in this subchapter and subchapter III of this chapter means any person who owns or operates facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission under this subchapter (other than facilities subject to such jurisdiction solely by reason of section 824e(e), 824e(f), 824i, 824j, 824j-1, 824k, 824o, 824p, 824q, 824r, 824s, 824t, 824u, and 824v).

(f) United States, State, political subdivision of a State, or agency or instrumentality thereof exempt

No provision in this subchapter shall apply to, or be deemed to include, the United States, a State or any political subdivision of a State, an electric cooperative that receives financing under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) or that sells less than 4,000,000 megawatt hours of electricity per year, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, or any corporation which is wholly owned, directly or indirectly, by any one or more of the foregoing, or any officer, agent, or employee of any of the foregoing acting as such in the course of his official duty, unless such provision makes specific reference thereto.

(g) Books and records

(1) Upon written order of a State commission, a State commission may examine the books, accounts, memoranda, contracts, and records of—

(A) an electric utility company subject to its regulatory authority under State law,

(B) any exempt wholesale generator selling energy at wholesale to such electric utility, and

(C) any electric utility company, or holding company thereof, which is an associate company or affiliate of an exempt wholesale generator which sells electric energy to an electric utility company referred to in subparagraph (A),

wherever located, if such examination is required for the effective discharge of the State commission's regulatory responsibilities affecting the provision of electric service.

(2) Where a State commission issues an order pursuant to paragraph (1), the State commission shall not publicly disclose trade secrets or sensitive commercial information.

(3) Any United States district court located in the State in which the State commission referred to in paragraph (1) is located shall have jurisdiction to enforce compliance with this subsection.

(4) Nothing in this section shall—

(A) preempt applicable State law concerning the provision of records and other information; or

(B) in any way limit rights to obtain records and other information under Federal law, contracts, or otherwise.

(5) As used in this subsection the terms "affiliate", "associate company", "electric utility company", "holding company", "subsidiary company", and "exempt wholesale generator" shall have the same meaning as when used in the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005.

16 U.S.C. § 824a

§ 824a. Interconnection and coordination of facilities; emergencies; transmission to foreign countries

(a) Regional districts; establishment; notice to State commissions

For the purpose of assuring an abundant supply of electric energy throughout the United States with the greatest possible economy and with regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources, the Commission is empowered and directed to divide the country into regional districts for the voluntary interconnection and coordination of facilities for the generation, transmission, and sale of electric energy, and it may at any time thereafter, upon its own motion or upon application, make such modifications thereof as in its judgment will promote the public interest. Each such district shall embrace an area which, in the judgment of the Commission, can economically be served by such interconnection and coordinated electric facilities. It shall be the duty of the Commission to promote and encourage such interconnection and coordination within each such district and between such districts. Before establishing any such district and fixing or modifying the boundaries thereof the Commission shall give notice to the State commission of each State situated wholly or in part within such district, and shall afford each such State commission reasonable opportunity to present its views and recommendations, and shall receive and consider such views and recommendations.

(b) Sale or exchange of energy; establishing physical connections

Whenever the Commission, upon application of any State commission or of any person engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy, and after notice to each State

commission and public utility affected and after opportunity for hearing, finds such action necessary or appropriate in the public interest it may by order direct a public utility (if the Commission finds that no undue burden will be placed upon such public utility thereby) to establish physical connection of its transmission facilities with the facilities of one or more other persons engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy, to sell energy to or exchange energy with such persons: *Provided*, That the Commission shall have no authority to compel the enlargement of generating facilities for such purposes, nor to compel such public utility to sell or exchange energy when to do so would impair its ability to render adequate service to its customers. The Commission may prescribe the terms and conditions of the arrangement to be made between the persons affected by any such order, including the apportionment of cost between them and the compensation or reimbursement reasonably due to any of them.

(c) Temporary connection and exchange of facilities during emergency

During the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged, or whenever the Commission determines that an emergency exists by reason of a sudden increase in the demand for electric energy, or a shortage of electric energy or of facilities for the generation or transmission of electric energy, or of fuel or water for generating facilities, or other causes, the Commission shall have authority, either upon its own motion or upon complaint, with or without notice, hearing, or report, to require by order such temporary connections of facilities and such generation, delivery, interchange, or transmission of electric energy as in its judgment will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest. If the parties affected by such order fail to agree upon the terms of any arrangement between them in carrying out such order, the Commission, after hearing held either before or after such order takes effect, may prescribe

by supplemental order such terms as it finds to be just and reasonable, including the compensation or reimbursement which should be paid to or by any such party.

(d) Temporary connection during emergency by persons without jurisdiction of Commission

During the continuance of any emergency requiring immediate action, any person engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy and not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission may make such temporary connections with any public utility subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission or may construct such temporary facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce as may be necessary or appropriate to meet such emergency, and shall not become subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission by reason of such temporary connection or temporary construction: *Provided,* That such temporary connection shall be discontinued or such temporary construction removed or otherwise disposed of upon the termination of such emergency: *Provided further,* That upon approval of the Commission permanent connections for emergency use only may be made hereunder.

(e) Transmission of electric energy to foreign country

After six months from August 26, 1935, no person shall transmit any electric energy from the United States to a foreign country without first having secured an order of the Commission authorizing it to do so. The Commission shall issue such order upon application unless, after opportunity for hearing, it finds that the proposed transmission would impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission may by its order grant such application in whole or in part, with such modifications and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may

find necessary or appropriate, and may from time to time, after opportunity for hearing and for good cause shown, make such supplemental orders in the premises as it may find necessary or appropriate.

(f) Transmission or sale at wholesale of electric energy; regulation

The ownership or operation of facilities for the transmission or sale at wholesale of electric energy which is (a) generated within a State and transmitted from the State across an international boundary and not thereafter transmitted into any other State, or (b) generated in a foreign country and transmitted across an international boundary into a State and not thereafter transmitted into any other State, shall not make a person a public utility subject to regulation as such under other provisions of this subchapter. The State within which any such facilities are located may regulate any such transaction insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection (e) of this section.

(g) Continuance of service

In order to insure continuity of service to customers of public utilities, the Commission shall require, by rule, each public utility to—

(1) report promptly to the Commission and any appropriate State regulatory authorities any anticipated shortage of electric energy or capacity which would affect such utility's capability of serving its wholesale customers,

(2) submit to the Commission, and to any appropriate State regulatory authority, and periodically revise, contingency plans respecting—

(A) shortages of electric energy or capacity, and

(B) circumstances which may result in such shortages, and

(3) accommodate any such shortages or circumstances in a manner which shall—

(A) give due consideration to the public health, safety, and welfare, and

(B) provide that all persons served directly or indirectly by such public utility will be treated, without undue prejudice or disadvantage.

16 U.S.C. § 824d

§ 824d. Rates and charges; schedules; suspension of new rates; automatic adjustment clauses

(a) Just and reasonable rates

All rates and charges made, demanded, or received by any public utility for or in connection with the transmission or sale of electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and all rules and regulations affecting or pertaining to such rates or charges shall be just and reasonable, and any such rate or charge that is not just and reasonable is hereby declared to be unlawful.

(b) Preference or advantage unlawful

No public utility shall, with respect to any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, (1) make or grant any undue preference or advantage to any person or subject any person to any undue prejudice or disadvantage, or (2) maintain any unreasonable difference in rates, charges, service, facilities, or in any other respect, either as between localities or as between classes of service.

(c) Schedules

Under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, every public utility shall file with the Commission, within such time and in such form as the Commission may designate, and shall keep open in convenient form and place for public inspection schedules showing all rates and charges for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and the classifications, practices, and regulations affecting such rates and charges, together with all contracts which in any manner affect or relate to such rates, charges, classifications, and services.

(d) Notice required for rate changes

Unless the Commission otherwise orders, no change shall be made by any public utility in any such rate, charge, classification, or service, or in any rule, regulation, or contract relating thereto, except after sixty days' notice to the Commission and to the public. Such notice shall be given by filing with the Commission and keeping open for public inspection new schedules stating plainly the change or changes to be made in the schedule or schedules then in force and the time when the change or changes will go into effect. The Commission, for good cause shown, may allow changes to take effect without requiring the sixty days' notice herein provided for by an order specifying the changes so to be made and the time when they shall take effect and the manner in which they shall be filed and published.

(e) Suspension of new rates; hearings; five-month period

Whenever any such new schedule is filed the Commission shall have authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, at once, and, if it so orders, without answer or formal pleading by the public utility, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, charge, classification, or service; and, pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Commission, upon filing with such schedules and delivering to the public utility affected thereby a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, charge, classification, or service, but not for a longer period than five months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after full hearings, either completed before or after the rate, charge, classification, or service goes into effect, the Commission may make such orders with

reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made at the expiration of such five months, the proposed change of rate, charge, classification, or service shall go into effect at the end of such period, but in case of a proposed increased rate or charge, the Commission may by order require the interested public utility or public utilities to keep accurate account in detail of all amounts received by reason of such increase, specifying by whom and in whose behalf such amounts are paid, and upon completion of the hearing and decision may by further order require such public utility or public utilities to refund, with interest, to the persons in whose behalf such amounts were paid, such portion of such increased rates or charges as by its decision shall be found not justified. At any hearing involving a rate or charge sought to be increased, the burden of proof to show that the increased rate or charge is just and reasonable shall be upon the public utility, and the Commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

(f) Review of automatic adjustment clauses and public utility practices; action by Commission; "automatic adjustment clause" defined

(1) Not later than 2 years after November 9, 1978, and not less often than every 4 years thereafter, the Commission shall make a thorough review of automatic adjustment clauses in public utility rate schedules to examine—

(A) whether or not each such clause effectively provides incentives for efficient use of resources (including economical purchase and use of fuel and electric energy), and

(B) whether any such clause reflects any costs other than costs which are—

(i) subject to periodic fluctuations and

(ii) not susceptible to precise determinations in rate cases prior to the time such costs are incurred.

Such review may take place in individual rate proceedings or in generic or other separate proceedings applicable to one or more utilities.

(2) Not less frequently than every 2 years, in rate proceedings or in generic or other separate proceedings, the Commission shall review, with respect to each public utility, practices under any automatic adjustment clauses of such utility to insure efficient use of resources (including economical purchase and use of fuel and electric energy) under such clauses.

(3) The Commission may, on its own motion or upon complaint, after an opportunity for an evidentiary hearing, order a public utility to—

(A) modify the terms and provisions of any automatic adjustment clause, or

(B) cease any practice in connection with the clause,

if such clause or practice does not result in the economical purchase and use of fuel, electric energy, or other items, the cost of which is included in any rate schedule under an automatic adjustment clause.

(4) As used in this subsection, the term "automatic adjustment clause" means a provision of a rate schedule which provides for increases or decreases (or both), without prior hearing, in rates reflecting increases or decreases (or

both) in costs incurred by an electric utility. Such term does not include any rate which takes effect subject to refund and subject to a later determination of the appropriate amount of such rate.

16 U.S.C. § 824e

§ 824e. Power of Commission to fix rates and charges; determination of cost of production or transmission

(a) Unjust or preferential rates, etc.; statement of reasons for changes; hearing; specification of issues

Whenever the Commission, after a hearing held upon its own motion or upon complaint, shall find that any rate, charge, or classification, demanded, observed, charged, or collected by any public utility for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or that any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affecting such rate, charge, or classification is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential, the Commission shall determine the just and reasonable rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and shall fix the same by order. Any complaint or motion of the Commission to initiate a proceeding under this section shall state the change or changes to be made in the rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract then in force, and the reasons for any proposed change or changes therein. If, after review of any motion or complaint and answer, the Commission shall decide to hold a hearing, it shall fix by order the time and place of such hearing and shall specify the issues to be adjudicated.

(b) Refund effective date; preferential proceedings; statement of reasons for delay; burden of proof; scope of refund order; refund orders in cases of dilatory behavior; interest

Whenever the Commission institutes a proceeding under this section, the Commission shall establish a refund effective date. In the case of a proceeding instituted on complaint, the refund effective date shall not be earlier than

the date of the filing of such complaint nor later than 5 months after the filing of such complaint. In the case of a proceeding instituted by the Commission on its own motion, the refund effective date shall not be earlier than the date of the publication by the Commission of notice of its intention to initiate such proceeding nor later than 5 months after the publication date. Upon institution of a proceeding under this section, the Commission shall give to the decision of such proceeding the same preference as provided under section 824d of this title and otherwise act as speedily as possible. If no final decision is rendered by the conclusion of the 180-day period commencing upon initiation of a proceeding pursuant to this section, the Commission shall state the reasons why it has failed to do so and shall state its best estimate as to when it reasonably expects to make such decision. In any proceeding under this section, the burden of proof to show that any rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential shall be upon the Commission or the complainant. At the conclusion of any proceeding under this section, the Commission may order refunds of any amounts paid, for the period subsequent to the refund effective date through a date fifteen months after such refund effective date, in excess of those which would have been paid under the just and reasonable rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice, or contract which the Commission orders to be thereafter observed and in force: *Provided*, That if the proceeding is not concluded within fifteen months after the refund effective date and if the Commission determines at the conclusion of the proceeding that the proceeding was not resolved within the fifteen-month period primarily because of dilatory behavior by the public utility, the Commission may order refunds of any or all amounts paid for the period subsequent to the refund effective date and prior to the conclusion of the proceeding. The refunds shall be made, with interest, to those persons who have paid those rates or charges which are the subject of the proceeding.

(c) Refund considerations; shifting costs; reduction in revenues; "electric utility companies" and "registered holding company" defined

Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, in a proceeding commenced under this section involving two or more electric utility companies of a registered holding company, refunds which might otherwise be payable under subsection (b) of this section shall not be ordered to the extent that such refunds would result from any portion of a Commission order that (1) requires a decrease in system production or transmission costs to be paid by one or more of such electric companies; and (2) is based upon a determination that the amount of such decrease should be paid through an increase in the costs to be paid by other electric utility companies of such registered holding company: *Provided*, That refunds, in whole or in part, may be ordered by the Commission if it determines that the registered holding company would not experience any reduction in revenues which results from an inability of an electric utility company of the holding company to recover such increase in costs for the period between the refund effective date and the effective date of the Commission's order. For purposes of this subsection, the terms "electric utility companies" and "registered holding company" shall have the same meanings as provided in the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended [15 U.S.C. 79 et seq.].

(d) Investigation of costs

The Commission upon its own motion, or upon the request of any State commission whenever it can do so without prejudice to the efficient and proper conduct of its affairs, may investigate and determine the cost of the production or transmission of electric energy by means of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Commission in cases where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate governing

the sale of such energy.

(e)(1) In this subsection:

(A) The term "short-term sale" means an agreement for the sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce that is for a period of 31 days or less (excluding monthly contracts subject to automatic renewal).

(B) The term "applicable Commission rule" means a Commission rule applicable to sales at wholesale by public utilities that the Commission determines after notice and comment should also be applicable to entities subject to this subsection.

(2) If an entity described in section 824(f) of this title voluntarily makes a short-term sale of electric energy through an organized market in which the rates for the sale are established by Commission-approved tariff (rather than by contract) and the sale violates the terms of the tariff or applicable Commission rules in effect at the time of the sale, the entity shall be subject to the refund authority of the Commission under this section with respect to the violation.

(3) This section shall not apply to—

(A) any entity that sells in total (including affiliates of the entity) less than 8,000,000 megawatt hours of electricity per year; or

(B) an electric cooperative.

(4)(A) The Commission shall have refund authority under paragraph (2) with respect to a voluntary short term sale of electric energy by the Bonneville Power Administration only if the sale is at an unjust and unreasonable rate.

(B) The Commission may order a refund under

subparagraph (A) only for short-term sales made by the Bonneville Power Administration at rates that are higher than the highest just and reasonable rate charged by any other entity for a short-term sale of electric energy in the same geographic market for the same, or most nearly comparable, period as the sale by the Bonneville Power Administration.

(C) In the case of any Federal power marketing agency or the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Commission shall not assert or exercise any regulatory authority or power under paragraph (2) other than the ordering of refunds to achieve a just and reasonable rate.

16 U.S.C. § 825*l*

§ 825*l*. Review of orders

(a) Application for rehearing; time periods; modification of order

Any person, electric utility, State, municipality, or State commission aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in a proceeding under this chapter to which such person, electric utility, State, municipality, or State commission is a party may apply for a rehearing within thirty days after the issuance of such order. The application for rehearing shall set forth specifically the ground or grounds upon which such application is based. Upon such application the Commission shall have power to grant or deny rehearing or to abrogate or modify its order without further hearing. Unless the Commission acts upon the application for rehearing within thirty days after it is filed, such application may be deemed to have been denied. No proceeding to review any order of the Commission shall be brought by any entity unless such entity shall have made application to the Commission for a rehearing thereon. Until the record in a proceeding shall have been filed in a court of appeals, as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it under the provisions of this chapter.

(b) Judicial review

Any party to a proceeding under this chapter aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission in such proceeding may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for any circuit wherein the licensee or public utility to which the order relates is located or has its principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the

District of Columbia, by filing in such court, within sixty days after the order of the Commission upon the application for rehearing, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to any member of the Commission and thereupon the Commission shall file with the court the record upon which the order complained of was entered, as provided in section 2112 of title 28. Upon the filing of such petition such court shall have jurisdiction, which upon the filing of the record with it shall be exclusive, to affirm, modify, or set aside such order in whole or in part. No objection to the order of the Commission shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Commission in the application for rehearing unless there is reasonable ground for failure so to do. The finding of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If any party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings before the Commission, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file with the court such modified or new findings which, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the original order. The judgment and decree of the court, affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such order of the Commission, shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28.

(c) Stay of Commission's order

The filing of an application for rehearing under subsection (a) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the Commission, operate as a stay of the Commission's order. The commencement of proceedings under subsection (b) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.